

# THE *Liguorian*

APRIL, 1950

*a magazine for the lovers of good reading*



*Devoted to the Unchangeable Principles of Truth, Justice, Democracy and Religion, and to All That Brings Happiness to Human Beings*

## These Marriage Annulments

Is a marriage annulment, in the Catholic Church, practically the same as a divorce outside the Church? Can almost anyone get one? Does money have anything to do with it? Many foolish suspicions and false statements will be avoided by those who know the following facts.

*D. F. Miller*

EVERY TIME the daily papers announce that some prominent person has received a "declaration of nullity", or, as it is usually inaccurately put, an "annulment of a previous marriage" from the Catholic Church, there is a great buzz of wondering and questioning among both Catholics and non-Catholics. Some say: "See, the Catholic Church does not believe in divorce, but she gets around it with annulments." Others say: "It seems that if you are prominent enough, or wealthy enough, you can get whatever you want from the Catholic Church." Others, though they do not make such brash and ignorant statements, do find, because of their ignorance, an annoying curdle of perplexity in their minds.

The process will start all over again, now that, in the midst of their sickeningly publicized infidelities, Roberto Rossellini and Ingrid Bergman have been quoted as anxious to seek annulments of their previous marriages in order that they may marry each other. Scandalized voices have already been raised over the very idea. It is important, therefore, that every Catholic have a clear idea of what the business of an-

nulments is all about, and be able to explain it to others who make foolish statements like the above.

A declaration of nullity concerning a certain marriage is not a fiction created by the Catholic Church to substitute for the granting of a complete divorce. It is not a trick formula used to make possible a second marriage for somebody who has a lawful partner still living. It is not something that can be purchased by any amount of money, nor that can be wangled from the Catholic Church because one happens to be a very famous or a very important person.

It is, on the contrary, merely a judicial declaration of the fact that when a certain marriage was attempted, at that very time there was a condition or a fact present that made the marriage an invalid one, and that this condition or fact was never afterward removed in such a way that the marriage became valid. Two things are actually required before the Catholic Church ever issues a declaration of nullity:

1) a real, invalidating obstacle to the marriage at the time it was constituted; and 2) sound, external, trustworthy proof of the presence of the

invalidating obstacle, and proof that the obstacle was never subsequently removed.

It is not enough, therefore, for a husband and wife who have grown tired of each other, or who have begun to cast longing eyes on someone else, to approach the authorities of the Church and merely state that there was an obstacle to the validity of their first marriage. If there is no contemporary evidence, no external proof, and if there are no trustworthy witnesses with objective facts to present concerning the invalidity of the marriage, the Catholic Church will never grant a declaration of nullity; she follows the principle that every marriage is presumed to be a valid marriage unless clear proof to the contrary can be established. Anyone who knows human nature can readily understand how many estranged couples, who want to marry somebody else, would apply for declarations of nullity if their mere say-so about their first marriage were to be accepted.

Because proof, evidence, testimony and fact are so important in this matter, it is obvious that there must be ecclesiastical courts to pass on the merits of each case. When Christ made marriage a sacrament, He entrusted its regulation and preservation to the authority of His Church. The Church, in turn, though it acts with the authority of Christ, is bound to use all intelligent and prudent means to come to a right decision in disputes about marriage. The usual means necessary for rightly deciding whether a marriage has been valid or invalid from the start is a court, just as there are civil courts for deciding civil suits and criminal courts for trying accused criminals. Ecclesiastical courts have a judge, and "defender of the bond of marriage" (who is like a district attorney or public prosecutor), and canon lawyers to present cases with their evi-

dence, etc. Each Catholic diocese has its ecclesiastical court; each such court is related to a court of appeal, to which cases may be taken for a second trial; then there is the highest ecclesiastical court of all (like the Supreme Court of the United States) to which a final appeal may be made. This last is called the Roman Rota.

Does a Catholic have to pay out considerable sums of money to bring an application for a declaration of nullity of marriage to an ecclesiastical court? Obviously, it costs money to maintain and operate a court, and if one is capable of paying what it costs to have a marriage trial, one is expected to pay. But money has nothing to do with the acceptance of cases, nor with the decisions that are handed down. For if one does not happen to have the means to pay for a marriage trial in an ecclesiastical court, he may present his petition "*in forma pauperis*", i.e., as one who is without material resources. In a typical year, for example, almost half the cases accepted by the supreme ecclesiastical court, the Roman Rota, are taken "*in forma pauperis*". And a study of the decisions of the Roman Rota in a typical year will show that, in those cases in which all the fees are paid, the decision is in no way influenced by the money, but only by the facts and the evidence laid before the court.

What are some of the obstacles that may sometimes be found to have been present at the time two people attempted marriage, and that rendered it invalid despite the appearances of validity? They are of three kinds, and every Catholic, even every non-Catholic should know what they are. Though of a wide variety, this does not mean that they are of frequent occurrence. Good Catholics are seldom in any danger of an invalid marriage, both because they know well what is necessary for

a good marriage, and because their pastor is obligated to make a thorough investigation of the conditions of their marriage. But exceptional cases do occur, especially among the ignorant, the poorly instructed, the fallen-aways in mixed marriages, etc. And invalid marriages sometimes occur among non-Catholics, that are only found out to be invalid when one of the persons involved enters the Church.

It will be noted, from this partial list of obstacles to valid marriage, that some of the causes of invalidity are of their nature very private and secret matters, that do not and should not receive publicity when a marriage is declared null. Therefore, just because the reasons for a declaration of nullity are not splashed across the newspapers, one should not jump to the conclusion that there was no good reason there.

#### **1. Invalid Ceremony**

The first kind of obstacle to a true marriage comes under the heading of "an invalid ceremony", called technically "defect of form". All Catholics should know that a Catholic can, in normal circumstances, be validly married only before a priest and two witnesses. This holds whether a Catholic is attempting to marry a Catholic or a non-Catholic.

A Catholic, therefore, who would go before a judge or a justice of the peace or a minister of a non-Catholic religion to attempt marriage, would be guilty of a great sin and would not be married at all; so long as he lived with his partner, he would be living in sin; every time he used the rights of marriage, he would be committing another sin; and he is giving great scandal. If, however, he later on repents, leaves his unlawful partner, makes up for the scandal he has given, and then wishes to marry someone validly before God, the Catholic Church not only could but would

be bound to declare him free to marry. He simply was not married before; his apparent marriage was subject to a declaration of nullity.

Sometimes people think that this constitutes an injustice, or that, simply because a person lived in sin for a period of time with a partner to whom he was not validly married, the Church should punish him by never letting him get married validly. The Church does have her punishments for those who abuse or desecrate the sacrament of marriage, but it must not be forgotten that the sins a man may have committed, with the exception of those that constitute impediments to marriage, have nothing to do with the question of his freedom to marry. If the Church were to deny the fact that a certain person is free to marry because he had committed sins or given scandal in the past, thousands would never be permitted to marry. It must also be remembered that God knows all the sins anyone has committed, and God knows whether one's repentance is sincere and effective, and God can and will punish unrepented and unforgiven sins according to their just deserts. But when a Catholic presents himself to the authorities of the Church as a candidate for the sacrament of marriage, it is her first responsibility to ascertain whether he is free to marry or not, whatever he may have done before.

#### **2. Invalid Consent to Marriage**

Sometimes a marriage is rendered invalid by the fact that one of the persons does not or cannot give the proper kind of consent to the marriage contract. This consent has to be a free, intelligent, self-binding act. If, at the time of the marriage ceremony, there was any circumstance that prevented it from being such an act, and if the proper steps were not taken afterward to make the consent a proper one, the marriage

would be invalid and could be declared such. Of course, as always, there must be clear proof; the consent is presumed to have been valid unless there is real proof to the contrary.

Here are some of the things that would vitiate the consent of a person attempting marriage:

1. If one partner were so completely intoxicated or drugged during the ceremony that he could not know what he was doing, consent to the marriage would not be a free, intelligent, human act and there would be no marriage.

2. If one partner to a marriage were, at the time of the ceremony, so insane or mentally deficient that a free, intelligent, human act was impossible, there would be no marriage.

3. If one partner to a marriage specifically and knowingly refused to give to the other the right to the body for marriage relations in making the contract, the very essence of the contract of marriage would not be fulfilled.

4. If one partner specifically, knowingly, intentionally and expressly refused to consent to marriage for life, but instead consented to be married only for a time, there would be no valid marriage.

5. If one partner had been forced into the marriage, either at the point of a gun, or under terrifying threats of grave harm from others unless this marriage were consented to, the consent would not be free and therefore not valid.

Many marriage trials, and declarations of nullity, center about this all-important matter of consent. If drunkenness, or insanity, or force, or fear, etc., can be proved to have been a circumstance of the marriage ceremony, there is nothing to do but to declare the marriage invalid. Again, we repeat, the proofs must be clear, and there is a lengthy, not to say exhaustive, list of directives that ecclesiastical courts must

follow to insure the objectivity of such proofs.

### 3. Invalidating Impediments

There are, everyone should know, a number of circumstances, that have nothing to do with the validity of the consent or correctness of the marriage ceremony, that can nevertheless make it impossible for a certain couple to be validly married. These are called invalidating impediments. Some of them are of the natural law and some of the ecclesiastical law; some can be removed by dispensation before marriage, and some cannot. But if, after a marriage has been attempted, it can be proved that there was an invalidating impediment present, either one that could not be dispensed from, or one that was not dispensed from, it becomes clear that the marriage was invalid and can be declared such.

The purpose of this article is merely to show the variety of causes that may make an apparent marriage invalid and so provide grounds for a declaration of nullity. Without, therefore, discussing the important reasons behind these impediments (which, in practically all instances, will be fairly obvious anyway), we merely list here the more important ones:

1. *Impotence.* This means a physical inability to exercise complete normal sex-relations, whether on the part of the man or woman. If it was present from the time of the attempted marriage and incurable, the marriage is invalid. This is one of the cases in which public explanations of a declaration of nullity are often not made. It can readily be seen why.

2. *An existing valid marriage bond.* In the eyes of the Church, no matter what civil authorities may have decreed, this constitutes an impediment to valid marriage for both Catholics and non-Catholics. It must be noted, however, that

the existing bond must be a valid one. Just because a person seems to have been validly married, as far as public knowledge goes, it should not be forgotten that there may have been something, from among the circumstances listed here, that rendered the marriage invalid.

Here it should be noted too that non-Catholic marriages are sometimes subject to the Pauline privilege, of which anyone can read in chapter 7, verses 12 to 15, in St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians. In brief, the case is this: if both partners to a certain marriage were never validly baptized as Christians, and were therefore technically pagans, and if one of them is converted and baptized as a Christian, and then finds that the still pagan partner refuses any longer to live peacefully with him in marriage, the pagan marriage may be dissolved and the convert declared free to marry as a Christian. Before such a decision can be handed down, proof must be presented for the fact that neither one had been validly baptized, and that the pagan refuses to live peacefully with the converted and baptized partner. Sometimes investigation and clear evidence reveal that what appeared to be baptism or what was called baptism was not true baptism at all, for example, because the minister used no water, or said the wrong words, etc. Such proof would make a person the equivalent of a pagan and subject to the Pauline privilege. Many complex cases revolve around difficult points of this kind.

3. *Lack of proper age.* The Catholic Church sets, as the age below which marriage would be invalid for a Catholic, the 16th year completed for a boy and the 14th year completed for a girl.

4. *Blood relationship.* All attempted marriages between persons related in the direct line, i.e., father, daughter, grand-

son, great-granddaughter, etc., are invalid. All attempted marriages between blood relatives to the 3rd degree in the collateral line (second cousins or closer) are invalid unless a dispensation has been granted.

5. *Relationship by marriage.* This invalidates all marriages in all degrees of the direct line, and to the second degree inclusive in the collateral line (first cousins or closer) unless a dispensation were given.

6. *Certain crimes against marriage.* Such crimes, which invalidate marriage unless a dispensation is given, are: a) adultery, combined with a promise of marriage; b) adultery, combined with the murder of the married person's partner; c) adultery, combined with an attempted marriage; d) the murder of a married person's partner, cooperated in by the married person and a paramour whom he intends to marry. These are so heinous an attack on marriage that the Catholic Church makes them an invalidating impediment to marriage for any couple that commits them.

These samples of invalidating impediments to marriage (there are others, such as abduction, spiritual relationship, etc.) have been listed merely to show that there are many circumstances that can enter into the question of the validity of a given marriage. Sometimes cases are mystifyingly complicated by doubts about consent, impediments and the marriage ceremony. Sometimes they are still more complicated because there are three or four previous marriages that have to be investigated. Sometimes persons who are involved in petitions for declaration of nullity become resentful because *their* case drags on for years, while somebody else's case was settled in a hurry. They have forgotten entirely this principle on which the Catholic Church stands: Every marriage is pre-

## *The Liguorian*

sumed to be valid until adequate proof is presented that it was invalid. If a case drags on, it is because adequate proof has not been presented, though the ecclesiastical courts may not close out the case because it is thought that such proof may be forthcoming in the future.

In all cases, however, nothing is of any consequence except the facts. It does not matter whether the person involved is prominent or not. (Only the cases of the prominent people appear in the newspapers; scores of cases for obscure people are tried every year.) It does not matter whether the person has money or not. Every Catholic, whether a born Catholic or a convert, has a right to be married in the Church

if that person, and his or her prospective partner, fulfill the requirements for a valid Catholic marriage. When they present themselves for marriage, the Catholic Church will investigate their freedom to marry according to the objective principles laid down in this article. If either one has been married before, the decision as to their freedom will be made according to the facts, not according to either the wishes of the persons involved or the gifts they may offer.

Whether it be an Ingrid Bergman and Roberto Rossellini, or a Joe Doakes and Mary Smith from the other side of the tracks, the freedom of anyone to marry will be judged by the facts of their previous lives as presented and proved.

## *The Lance*

O Roman lance that pierced the side  
of our Redeemer crucified,

O tell me what was in that Heart  
which you were forced to tear apart.

Did you find It broke in two  
because of hate of men untrue,

And did you see the scars of sin  
that I seared there without chagrin?

Or rather did you see It bleed  
for love of souls It just had freed,

Or did It lay Its bosom bare  
for you to make a doorway there,

So all Its loved ones, free from sin,  
might follow you and enter in?

O tell me! What was in that Heart  
which you were forced to tear apart?

J. Peifer



## For Wives and Husbands Only

D. F. Miller

### The Dangers of Child-Bearing

*Problem:* "What is the duty of a husband and wife when a doctor warns the wife that it will be dangerous for her to have another child? We have three children, and I suffered considerably with the last one. Both my husband and I feel that it would be wrong to risk my life when I already have the three children to raise. But we also know that it is wrong to practice birth-control. We are confused, and badly in need of guidance."

*Solution:* With due respect for the many upright physicians who are practicing obstetrics, it may yet be stated that there are many doctors who recommend the sin of birth-control whenever they foresee that a wife will have the least bit of difficulty in child-bearing. It is our experience (and we have had more than 20 years of it, much of it dealing with the moral problems of married people) that 1) many doctors do a great disservice to their patients by making them fear child-bearing because of minor or unimportant complications; and 2) that they are often influenced in this by the common desire of wives for any excuse for practicing birth-control. There is solid ground for the opinion, recently expressed in high medical circles, that the process of gestation and child-bearing often cures certain physical and nervous disabilities of women. On the other hand, there is no question that the practice of birth-control causes many nervous and physical disorders among women.

This is not to imply that there are no cases in which a certain pathological condition would render child-bearing a grave danger to life. Serious heart trouble, advanced kidney infections and such like, would be examples. In such cases a doctor can be quite certain of his diagnosis and quite certain of the degree of danger, and has the obligation of giving a warning that is proportionate to the facts. But when a doctor speaks in rather vague terms to a wife of danger in having another baby, or tells her to "be careful" because she had trouble with a previous child, she and her husband should 1) ask for the specific reasons for the danger; 2) consult another physician to check on the matter; 3) if doubt remains, lead a normal married life and, with perfect trust, leave the issue in the hands of God. We know of innumerable cases in which such trust was wonderfully rewarded. In all situations of this kind, a good Catholic doctor is of the utmost importance, since three out of four non-Catholic doctors are quick to recommend birth-control.

# Murder Without Mercy

Three short stories that may be happening in your neighborhood right now. They happen so often that we shouldn't be surprised if some who read of them here have taken part in them.

L. G. Miller

FOLLOWING ARE incidents from the careers of several respectable assassins.

Now the chief assassin of all, of course, is named Satan. He is concerned not so much with the assassination of bodies (although that too may enter into his plans) as he is with the murder of souls.

In the thousands of years during which he has been active in his nefarious trade, he has in each succeeding generation of men built up a corps of earnest little helpers intent upon relieving him of much of his work. They do not, of course, call themselves salesmen of Satan, nor, in many cases, are they aware of the dubious distinction which is theirs. But they are nonetheless bending every effort to increase the population of hell.

They are, in short, the purveyors of scandal.

They are the men and women who, for the sake of greed or simply because of some perverse itch in their psychological makeup, work manfully and cheerfully at their business of assassinating human souls. They belong to *Murder, Incorporated*, since they are the murderers of souls, and of their sin Christ spoke with more severity than of any other human weakness. Of the great scandal-giver He said:

*"It were better for him that a millstone should be hanged about his neck and that he should be drowned in the depth of the sea."*

Take the case of Mr. Fred Blake, for

instance. Mr. Blake both by nature and inclination is a salesman. When he was released from the army a few years ago, having served with great distinction in the Quartermaster Corps, he immediately looked around for a job that would enable him to exercise his talents, and at the same time pay him well, according to his ability. It did not take long before he discovered a certain firm which advertises itself as carrying a line of "medical specialties."

Now young Mr. Blake didn't much care what he sold, so long as it sold well, and he was assured at his interview with the head of the firm that these "medical specialties" sold very well indeed.

Still, when he looked over the line of goods, Mr. Blake hesitated for just a moment.

"I don't know," he said. "Couldn't a man get into trouble, selling these things?"

"Don't worry about that, my friend. We've got ourselves covered. Our salesmen don't have to worry."

Young Mr. Blake didn't hesitate any longer. He took the job, and with a satchel filled with sample wares, began making his rounds to doctors' offices and drug stores.

He found indeed that business was good in his particular line. He was able to buy a new car, and as his commissions mounted, soon had a nice account in the bank. Only occasionally did he encounter sales resistance.

"Good morning, doctor. I represent

Medical Specialties, Incorporated, and I thought you might be interested in what we have to offer."

Then the business of opening his satchel, and displaying his wares to the prospective customer. Once in a while the following conversation would ensue:

"I don't want any of that stuff. You won't make any sale here."

"But why not, doc? Every doctor keeps a line like this on hand."

"Not this one. I'm a Catholic, and I try to live up to it."

"What of it? I'm a Catholic too, for all of that. I could name you several Catholic doctors in this town who dispense our products, and lots of Catholic married people who use them, too."

"Sorry, mister. That doesn't cut any ice with me. Take your stuff and get out, and the quicker the better."

Whenever young Mr. Blake has an experience like that, it makes him stop and think for a moment.

You'd better stop and think, young Mr. Blake. You'd better think long and hard. Rated on your present performance, you qualify for a millstone around your neck. You would be better off in the depths of the sea than facing the thousands of people on judgment day for whom you have made it easy to rebel against the law of God.

•

Consider for a moment Mrs. Harrison Hartley.

Mrs. Hartley's husband has been mildly successful in business, and he and his family have recently moved to a very respectable part of town. It is one of Mrs. Hartley's consuming ambitions to enter into the rarefied atmosphere of High Society.

Our good lady is very active in the Guild of St. Godolias. According to some rather uncharitable persons, the Guild membership is made up of matrons who have had too few children,

and consequently more time on their hands than is good for them. But that opinion doubtless is motivated by envy and jealousy.

The Guild meets once a week, and is presently engaged in the worthy cause of raising money for the purchase of school textbooks, destined for the illiterate children of Sumatra.

Mrs. Hartley is in her early forties, and has two children, a boy and a girl, who are away during the year at fashionable boarding schools.

Along with her interest in the Guild of St. Godolias, Mrs. Hartley takes it upon herself to dispense free advice to her friends when she feels they stand in need of it. And to her way of thinking, such a need arises when a young mother among her friends seems bent on having a large family.

When she talks to such a young mother, perhaps in the course of a call in the interests of the Guild, the conversation goes something like this:

"Well, my dear, now that we have taken care of business, let's just chat. How have you been?"

"Just fine."

"That's good. I was worried about you."

"You were?"

"Yes indeed. Having three children in only five years! My dear, I should think you would be all worn out!"

"Well, it keeps me busy taking care of them, alright."

"I should think it would! Such a huge family, and you so young!"

"Oh, my husband and I love children."

"Of course, of course. I love the dear little things too. But you mustn't overdo it, you know."

"Oh?"

"I'm older than you, my dear, and I wouldn't say it if I were not your friend. But it just isn't done nowadays."

"What isn't done?"

"Why, darling, I mean having a whole brood of children. There's so much work for a woman to do in the world, and you must plan your life so as not to be tied down."

"Do you really think so?"

"Yes, my dear. Think of how much good you can do outside the home."

"But I don't just see—"

"Darling, I'm going to be really confidential with you. Didn't your doctor ever tell you how you could avoid having children?"

"No, my doctor wouldn't do that. He's a Catholic and a good one, too."

"Certainly, certainly, darling. We're all Catholics, and we try to live up to our faith."

"Well, I don't see how I can 'avoid having children,' and still live up to my faith. Not if my husband and I are going to lead a normal married life."

"But that's just what I'm telling you, darling. It's not normal, having such a large family in such a short time. Now I'll tell you what to do. Do you know that big drug-store down town on Market and Tenth St.?"

"Yes."

"Well, you stop there the next time you are shopping and ask for . . ."

Dear Mrs. Harrison Hartley, so well-groomed and chic, as you depart from your friend's home, having completed your little errand of mercy, do any twinges of conscience at all make themselves felt in what passes for your soul? Or has your conscience been so shrivelled up by hypocrisy that the juice of compunction has long since dried up for good?

Dear Mrs. Hartley, so eminently respectable and well-scented in your expensive fur coat, did you ever reflect on what Christ said of the hypocritical Pharisees? "Whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear to men beautiful, but

within are full of dead men's bones and all filthiness."

If there is any twinge in your conscience, Mrs. Hartley, you had better thank God for it, and nurse it along into full-blown sorrow for your scandal-giving. Otherwise, it would be better for you if a millstone were tied around your neck, and you were drowned in the depths of the sea.

In any city of size you will find, located at strategic points, little stores given over to the display and sale of papers, magazines, and twenty-five cent books.

The place I have in mind in one of our larger cities is run by Mr. Carlo "Chip" Caruso. Mr. Caruso is a devotee of the time-worn principle that the customer is always right. Putting the principle into practice, he sees to it that every variety of reading taste is catered to in his establishment.

Mr. Caruso's place is not much more than a hole in the wall, much longer than it is wide, and along one side, almost from floor to ceiling, is a rack, upon which are displayed all manner of periodicals.

Conspicuously in view at the most convenient spot are the respectable weekly and monthly "slicks". Immediately above them, one entire row on the rack is given over to the countless movie magazines, together with *True Romance*, *True Confessions*, *True Love Stories* and many others of the same ilk. A further casual search reveals the presence of myriad sports magazines, astrological journals and adventure pulps. The inevitable comics are present in infinite number in all their gory attractiveness. Any kind of magazine you want can be found at Chip's place, and a good many that you never heard of, and a good thing you didn't.

In the top row of Mr. Caruso's maga-

zine rack there are a number of magazines which fall into a class by themselves. They have titles like "Laugh", "Gag", and "Ginger", and they are frankly and crudely concerned, both in illustration and text, with the exploitation of sex.

Sex in fact figures quite prominently in Mr. Caruso's inventory of reading material. Besides the magazines referred to above, he has a supply of books on the subject under the counter for certain select customers, books of such a lurid description that he doesn't dare display them openly. Among the books that are displayed openly are some that are quite bad enough. Books for instance on the sex relation in marriage, which Mr. Caruso sells quite cheerfully to high school students and in fact anyone who can pay the cash price. There are other books among the twenty-five cent reprints which obviously have been published solely because of their titillating possibilities.

Every now and then Mr. Caruso is the victim of a rather disagreeable interview. Nearby in St. Joseph's parish is an organization known as the Legion of Mary, and one of the projects of the St. Joseph's Legion is to persuade news dealers in the neighborhood to adhere to certain fundamental standards of decency in what they offer to the reading public. In most cases the legionnaires have met with fair success. Mr. Caruso is an exception.

Mr. Caruso, in fact, professes to be quite annoyed whenever one of the Legion members approaches him.

"Look," he says, "I wish you would quit bothering me. I'm a business man, see, and I've got to make a living."

"But surely you don't have to sell that kind of stuff to make a living."

"What kind of stuff? I don't look at every magazine I have in my rack."

"Oh, come now, Mr. Caruso. You know what magazines and books we mean. Do you want us to take them down from the rack and put them on the counter here?"

"Never mind, never mind. Maybe I know what's in them and maybe I don't. Anyway, it's no concern of mine what's in them. I'm just here to sell them."

"Even though people are hurt?"

"What do you mean, hurt? Who ever got hurt reading a book?"

"Would you give them to your ten-year-old daughter to read?"

"That's different. As I told you before, I'm in business here, and I got to look out for myself. As long as people pay me for what they buy here, what happens to them afterwards is none of my business."

In other words, Mr. Caruso, you are repeating what Cain said when God searched him out and asked him the whereabouts of his brother, Abel. "How should I know," Cain said. "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Cain said that, even though he had just murdered his brother in cold blood.

How many consciences have you murdered, Mr. Caruso, with your racy selection of magazines and books? How many sex crimes have you been indirectly responsible for?

It will all be brought out one day. It will be a rather terrible thing for you if ten thousand condemned souls throng around you and shriek at you as their betrayer.

Perhaps that's why for you also, Mr. Caruso, it would be better if a millstone were tied around your neck, and you were drowned in the depths of the sea.

# Pre-Marriage Clinic

D. F. Miller

## Approval of Divorce Before Marriage

*Problem:* "I am engaged to a non-Catholic man, and the other day he mentioned (for the first time) the fact that he believes in divorce. He said that he did not expect our marriage ever to break up, but that he was convinced that when any marriage did not turn out to be happy, the persons should be allowed to separate and made free to try marriage with someone else. As a Catholic, I know that true marriage has to be permanent, and that there can be no such thing as a valid marriage after a divorce. My question is: Do you think I can take a chance on marrying a man with the views expressed above?"

*Solution:* The chance you take in marrying such a man is very great. As a matter of fact, if he were to apply his thought about divorce directly to your own marriage, and expressly to state that he was not entering into a permanent and indissoluble union, but into one that could be dissolved by divorce if and when he wished to have it dissolved, your very marriage would be invalid. His very consent to marriage in that case would be vitiated. However, if he did not expressly apply his approval of divorce to your marriage, but actually consented to take you as his wife "till death", the marriage would be valid. But it would still be one in which your chances of happiness and security would be very meagre.

There is nothing more essential to happiness in marriage than an exclusion of even a theoretical approval of divorce. The man who approves of divorce for unhappy marriages can, after a few years of married life, think of a hundred reasons for saying that his marriage is unhappy. He can be attracted to a new face. He can rebel against the expense of raising his own children. He can accuse his wife of having faults he never knew of before marriage. He can get into a rage over some fancied grievance and stalk out of the house forever. Also, a man who approves in general of divorce, will almost surely approve of other things (birth-control, for example) that are contrary to God's laws and to the conscience of a Catholic.

My advice would, therefore, be that if you cannot succeed in changing his general attitude about divorce, you should not take a chance on marrying this man. The natural law concerning divorce and remarriage, and concerning other crimes against marriage, is not too difficult to explain, and many non-Catholics accept the explanation and agree with it once it is given. But if your boy friend does not accept the explanation or refuses to agree with it, don't take a chance with him. It is the wife who pays most, in a marriage in which the husband has doubts about indissolubility.

# What They Think About Catholics

The second part of a report of actual statements made about Catholics by non-Catholics. Some are from letters inspired by the Knights of Columbus advertisements explaining Catholic doctrine; others are from published anti-Catholic material.

*D. J. Corrigan*

NO CATHOLIC can understand the problems connected with bringing non-Catholics to the truth unless he knows something of what many non-Catholics have been taught to believe about the Catholic Church and Catholics. There is some pretty grisly material here, even though we have edited out the more filthy and outrageous specimens at hand. At the same time it is good for the bad Catholic to take a glimpse at some of these statements, in order that he may ask himself whether his bad example does not add fuel to the fire of hatred for the Catholic Church that burns in the hearts of so many human beings. It is well known that, illogical though it may be, the whole Catholic Church and all Catholics are often judged by the example that is given by a single bad Catholic.

Fear, bordering on hysteria, is the keynote of many of the letters written to the Catholic Information Bureau as a result of the Knights of Columbus advertisements that have been appearing in newspapers and magazines. (It must be repeated that the opposition letters are a mere fraction of the letters received; the vast majority of them are respectful, commendatory, and written in quest of further information.) Here is one of the hysterical numbers:

To the Knights of Columbus:

I was just looking at this piece in *Liberty*

"You Hear Strange Things about Catholics"). My mother was a Catholic, but not Roman. I have nothing against Catholic people. But your church is very rotten. We know that Catholics worship false gods. Do you remember what the Roman Church did in Spain? I don't curse Catholics, I pray for them. We know that Catholics confess to a priest and not to God. Why don't the priest get married, which God demanded? I won't put my name on this letter as the Catholic Church tried to kill my mother and I would likely get the same.

The source of such unfounded fears is not hard to find. Much Protestant propaganda continually exploits this human emotion. Thus a Presbyterian minister published a leaflet in 1946 with the title: "Deport the Roman Beast". It runs as follows:

Every Knight of Columbus, with every Roman Catholic priest and bishop who will not renounce his allegiance to the pope, should be deported. Every Roman priest should be compelled to have his own wife. The purgatorial fraud suppressed by law. Every confession box closed up and every nunnery door opened, and the nuns have their own husbands, and every other un-American Roman principle swept from our land and make the United States of America the true and actual home of the freedom of mankind,

untrammelled (sic) by political Roman Catholicism. Every child in America should be put in Uncle Sam's school, and the Bible read in every school room of America. One School—one Flag—one Language and one Ruler—Uncle Sam—and not the Pope of Rome.

Here is another leaflet, in the same vein, printed in 1946, and entitled "Abolish the Nunneries and Save the Girls":

There are more than 200,000 American girls and women who are now held prisoners behind the convent walls and dungeon doors of the Roman Catholic Church.

The able-bodied bachelors who tote the keys to those convents defy the American people and say that the state shall not inspect those prisoners of the potentate who is the despotic ruler of Roman Catholicism. . . . They tell us that the buxom girls and women whom they keep under lock and key want to devote their lives to religion and charity. If that is all, why lock them up?

Merciful God, wake up the sleepy Protestants to a sense of their responsibility to help free these precious, blood-bought, deceived women. God Almighty knows what goes on in those hell-holes. . . . Sin cannot be hid from the penetrating eye of God. . . .

Libels like the above might be thought to come from the lunatic fringe, but there is so much of it that one hesitates to extend lunacy that far. It is more difficult, however, to find an excuse for the following selection, taken from a recent issue of a supposedly dignified Protestant publication, with its serious misstatements of historical facts:

Before the Reformation nearly all Christians belonged to the one Roman Catholic Church. But during the Middle Ages this

church had adopted serious errors in doctrine and practice. Some men saw these errors and protested against them, but it was Martin Luther, then a Catholic priest himself, who started the great movement which delivered thousands upon thousands from the deadly errors of the Catholic Church. On October 31, 1517, he posted on the door of the Castle church of Wittenburg 95 theses or statements against a terrible Catholic practice known as the sale of indulgences. *This was really the selling of the forgiveness of sins for money.* (Italics ours!) The Catholic Church taught that its priests and bishops had the right to forgive sins and that forgiveness could be obtained by the payment of a sum of money or by doing some hard thing or by undergoing discomfort or suffering. The Bible was kept out of the hands of the common people and only priests and clergymen were supposed to read it. It was thought that it was dangerous for others to read it. . . .

How are respectable readers of the respectable Protestant magazine that printed the above to know that most of it is lies?

Here is a quotation from a dodger very recently printed, entitled "Rum and Debauchery":

The Roman Hierarchy is the founder of the liquor traffic. The Roman Hierarchy is the "mother of harlots and abominations of this earth". (Rev., 17) Evangelize Romans and you destroy the liquor traffic. All the priests use it. Monks and nuns are busy making it in their monasteries and ship it to all parts of the earth. The Benedictine brand—the most deadly poison of all—made from the beetle (bug juice). Only Rome knows how to make this hell fluid, used in red light dens. They make their own bottles. . . . Can the devil beat this?

Most of the critical letters addressed

to the Knights of Columbus are very offensive. They state categorically (usually in ungrammatical language) that Catholic literature is all lies, that priests and nuns are all immoral, that only fear keeps Catholics in the Church, that the Pope and bishops are out to destroy the government of the United States and to conquer the world. They usually display a bleak ignorance of history, of the fundamental facts of Christianity, and of elementary logic that is weird and unbelievable until one comes face to face with it. An old man writes:

Now we know by all printed matter in your church practice that you are either a lot of ignorant dumb bells or first class liars.

This came from a woman, whose husband must have a tough time of it:

I am a Protestant and very proud of it, but my husband is Catholic, I am sorry to say. Before I'd leave my religion—the true teaching of Jesus Christ, I'd divorce my husband and he knows it. Converts to the Catholic faith are always Protestant in their hearts. . . . I'd just as soon have Hitler or Stalin over me as the Pope of Rome. The Catholic Church teaches hatred and religious intolerance. If you ever let people out of your clutches and they could read the Bible—I mean like ours, the first one written by the Greeks as that was what the apostles were. It was you Romans that scourged and condemned our Lord. . . . The only way you keep your people is by fear. Protestants go to church because they want to, not by being forced. . . . Well, I get disgusted even thinking about you hypocrites. Stay as dumb as you are. I won't even give you my name and address, as I wouldn't believe anything you told me, anyway. The Bible speaks for itself.

From one who signs himself "a friend":

You are no more Christians than the Communists but two of a kind who are fighting with deceit and corruption to dominate the world for the devil.

A letter from Ada, Oklahoma, anonymous like many others, is presented here just as it was type-written:

Have a good friend that handed me your study corse. Hers my answer. I never spent much time reading damnable lies, my conclusion is that the catholic (no church) political move is the devil incarnet and the chief of liars. Take your damnable pergatory, not one word in the bible to substantiate your pergatory, just a scheme to pull money out of fool catholics whose folks died in sin and every preast should be prosecuted for obtaining money by false representing pergatory as a stopping place between earth and heaven. After reading your literature, I don't beleave thers a sincable person on earth that can subscribe to the catholic faith (not a faith) just a robbing system.

No, there never existed a more damnable move on earth than the PAGAN catholic church. Just think of the millions of slaves, NUNS locked up like stock every night, to slave their lives away for a lying priesthood. Am afraid to sign my name, for i know history, and the way Rev Black went in Marshal Texas and many others.

Several grades above this in grammar is the following, which goes after the Jesuits in historic Protestant fashion, who, by the way, had nothing to do with the Knights of Columbus advertisements:

The spending of \$345,000 on this kind of propaganda is a total loss. You already have your regular dupes, but anyone else

## The Liguorian

you could entice would have to be a moron or those on the border of insanity. It is widely known that your church is based on falsehood, but it is astonishing that the crawling Jesuits couldn't do better than the crude lies now being served up to the public, crude and stupid is the only way to describe such tactics.

That there are ignorant Catholics, doing an immense amount of harm by their own foolish statements about Catholic teaching, is evidenced by some letters. One reads:

First of all, please educate your people before educating non-Catholics. Much of what you deny has been told me by your own people as the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. Believe me, I know.

That the false propaganda of Protestant publications is still swaying minds and hearts is evident from dozens of letters that revert to the old, frequently exploded, calumnies and mis-statements. Thus, in answer to the advertisement entitled "The Bible is a Catholic Book", one correspondent wrote:

That statement is the product of a true Jesuit. Why has the Catholic Church in other countries burnt more Bibles than it has published? Why did the Roman Catholic Inquisition burn people at the stake because they believed in the Bible? Why has the Roman Church and still does keep the people illiterate where they have control of education? Why does the Roman Church forbid the reading of the Bible wherever they have power to do so? Where in the Bible does Christ require celibacy of priests? Why does a priest refuse permission of his parishioners to enter a Protestant church? *In this day of tolerance!* What is the racket behind these indulgences? What was the amount paid

the Pope to nullify Tyrone Power's first marriage and OK the second? Millions, I bet. Who are you to speak of tolerance, when all marriages outside the Church are not legal and all children born of them are bastards?

That Protestant swallowed in one gulp a whole dish of historic untruths. But here is a Communist expressing himself in response to the advertisements:

So the "Catholic" Church now has to take to advertising to try to justify the continuance of the greatest "racket" ever put over on the people of the world. The "Catholic" Church continually talks (talks only) about so-called freedom and is the very bitterest enemy of the Soviet Union where they are endeavoring to build a society based on the teachings of Christ (*Stalin wouldn't like that.* Ed.) and not like the Catholic Church just talk about it and make a great racket with cushy jobs for thousands of fat lazy priests. If the Church has so many converts, would you kindly state why the Catholic Church finds it necessary to force people to foist this racket on their children even unto those yet unborn? No wonder they are sore about Vladimir Ilyitch Ulyanov as he stole a leaf from their book and put his system over by grabbing the children and training them in the same way. This is the only way the great racket of the Catholic Church can continue, for if children were allowed freedom of choice until they became of age under law, how many of them would fail to see what a hypocritical racket the whole lousy Christian religion is when it preaches to the public but fails to take any stand on the great questions of war, poverty, and disease and condemns a great social revolution which offers the only hope for some solution of these problems . . .

## The Liguorian

Another correspondent does not like the Catholic Church because it has:

dances, bingoes, card parties, raffles, chance games: to make money, money, money. All an abomination to the Lord.

Another states:

The U. S. A. was originated by Protestants. Not a Roman Catholic signed the Declaration of Independence.

Some seized the opportunity to plug for their notion of religion. Here's a spiritualist:

Dispense with all hypocrisy. Get away from fiction, mystery and the miraculous by simplifying with sincerity. Priestcraft is anti-Christ, makes a sorry mess of Christianity and has ample reason to fear true spirituality manifesting through mediumship. Priestcraft has as much use for Spiritualism as the devil for holy water. Jesus Christ was and is a Spiritualist Medium.

And here is one who thinks himself to be a theosophist:

The same chance that brought you here and gave you your inclinations and predilection still controls your destiny. Religion has positively nothing to do with it. Creed, cant, costume and ceremony are but fog, foam, froth and futility. Being good is doing good, everything else is selfishness.

Teach truth, honesty, knowledge, unselfishness, kindness, helpfulness and self-reliance.

The Bible must be recognized as fiction, and denied as inspired. Its contradictions and mistakes prove its human origin.

We are but millions of millions caught in the River of No Return. All have gone, are going, and will go the same way, so WHY WORRY? If we are immortal, it

is a simple fact of nature. Krishma, the original Christ, was born 1200 B. C. in India.

A sample of fuzzy thinking and made up dogmas belongs here:

A Catholic has no religion, since he does not believe in Jehova, but in a human being, a man, born of mortal man and woman (Joseph and Mary, both Hebrews). The fact that he was born as all others precludes his being other than mere mortal, dust and dirt as are all, and made partly human in some cases only by the divine spark of life which the creator of all (the great I AM) endowed us with (even the ignorant and superstitious, e. g., the Catholic Church and its followers.) Joshua of Nazareth brought about his own doom by his interference with matters of no concern of his, for own ambitions of power, and the fact that the Roman Christians of 2,000 years ago thought he was too presumptuous for his own good and theirs.

Many letters harped heavily on an old thesis of Protestantism, that all you have to do to be saved is to "believe". Some quoted this passage of a pamphlet that makes it unbelievably simple:

The simple plan of salvation is: YOU ARE A SINNER; because you are a sinner you MUST DIE or else believe in Christ who was your SUBSTITUTE and died in YOUR PLACE. Just call upon HIM, REALIZING you are a sinner and ask Him to have mercy upon you and save you for JESUS' SAKE. Then just take HIM AT HIS WORD and BY FAITH CLAIM SALVATION. You say: "Surely that is not all that is necessary to do to be saved." Yes it is, absolutely all. Thank God many have been won to Christ by this simple plan. It is SCRIPTURAL. IT IS GOD'S PLAN. . . .

## The Liguorian

From this sampling of what people have to say about religion, and particularly about the Catholic religion, it can be seen how much confusion, misinformation, falsified history, and outright lying have helped to form the judgments of thousands. It can also be understood, from this study, why people do hate and fear the Catholic Church; they can do nothing else but hate and fear her, since it has been pictured to them as so terrible a thing.

As was said before, the number of critical letters received by the Knights of Columbus in response to their adver-

tisements is very few in comparison with the favorable and interested replies. A typical example of the good that is being accomplished may be seen from the following letter, one of thousands that are similar:

Please send a copy of your free booklet, Pamphlet No. 3-MM, concerning questions on the Bible. I have been following your articles with interest, and feel your information in them is serving a much needed purpose. More power to you, and may God bless your work.

### Voices From the Grave

From an article in the *Rotarian* come the following instances of curious provisions which were made in actual probated wills:

An actor specified in his will that he was to be cremated, and ten percent of his ashes thrown in the face of his agent.

A bachelor left a sum of money to each of three ladies, all of whom had rejected his proposals of marriage years before, with the comment: "To them I owe all my worldly happiness."

One rich man worded his will as follows: "To my wife I leave her lover and the knowledge that I wasn't the fool she thought I was. To my son I leave the pleasure of earning a living. For 25 years he thought that pleasure was mine. To my daughter I leave \$100,000. She will need it. The only good piece of business her husband ever did was to marry her."

And a fiery Englishman left a sizable fund to provide whiskey annually to 20 Irishmen, on the condition that they were to visit his grave on a certain day each year, be given knives and clubs, and then whiskey, which they had to consume on the spot. "Knowing the Irish as I do," the will went on, "my conviction is that they will destroy each other, and when, in the course of time, the race is exterminated, this neighborhood at least may be colonized by respectable citizens."

### Epitaph Department

On the gravestone of a dyer in the cemetery of St. Nicholas at Yarmouth is the following epitaph:

Here lies a man who first did dye,  
When he was twenty-four,  
And yet he lived to reach the age,  
Of hoary hairs, fourscore.  
But now he's gone, and certain 'tis  
He'll not die any more.

# Abuses in Labor Unions

This is written both for non-union Americans who see only the abuses in labor unions, and for union men who have been discouraged by abuses.

R. J. Miller

THIS ARTICLE will deal with the Catholic attitude to union abuses. That there are abuses in American unions is nothing surprising, seeing that union members and officials are fallen human beings. The fact is kept before the public, moreover, in a very prominent way by the great metropolitan newspapers and by "labor columnists"; though it is a strange thing (an impartial observer might be led to think) that the labor columnists and radio commentators, who profess to be experts on labor relations, should so often and so consistently be experts on the dark side of the union picture rather than on the good side.

Nor is the fact of union abuses denied by union men and union officials. A good deal of labor officials' work, as a matter of fact, has to do with union abuses. And union members are sometimes, or rather only too often, so affected by union abuses that they cease to take an active interest in all union affairs.

The question then may well be worded as follows: what is the Catholic attitude to union abuses 1) from the inside, and 2) from the outside? "From the inside": what should be the attitude of Catholic union members to abuses in their own unions; and "from the outside": what should be the attitude of Catholics outside of the unions to such abuses in general?

From the inside, then, one of the first things that comes to mind is a matter involving union *officials*, namely

*the abuse of power.* Pius XII gave the Catholic stand on this danger or abuse in an audience September 11, 1949, to the members of the Christian Workers' Movement of Belgium:

Finally may Our blessing assist the hard-working Christian class of Belgium to emerge safe and sound from the danger which at present, in some degree, everywhere threatens the workers' movement. We mean the temptation to abuse.

We speak of abuse—and certainly not of the legitimate use—of the strength of organization.

This temptation is just as formidable and dangerous as that of abusing the strength of private capital.

The strength of an organization, no matter how powerful one may consider it to be, is not of itself an element of order. Recent and current history gives continuously tragic proof of this. Whoever has eyes to see can easily convince himself of this.

Today as yesterday, in the future, as well as in the past, a firm and solid position can be built only on the foundation laid by nature, and in reality by the Creator, as the basis of the only genuine stability.

That is why we never tire of recommending the immediate drafting of a public law concerning economic life and all society on the basis of organized collaboration between labor and management in the industries and professions.

John C. Cort in his column on labor

in the *Commonweal* for January 6, 1950, put it forcefully too in the way of friendly advice to union officials.

Let's not make the same mistake that the rugged employers made when they cried out: "We are a law unto ourselves—hands off!" Let's yield gracefully, brothers, to necessity and the common good.

The CIO has had bitter experience with such abuse of power on the part of certain officials, who took advantage of their position to line up entire unions, even against the inclinations of the rank and file, in favor of Communism. The 1949 national convention of the CIO, it should be added, took a definite attitude on this particular abuse: an attitude which might well be called the "Catholic" attitude on the matter: it voted these officials right out of the CIO.

Mr. Daniel Tobin, head of the great Teamsters' Union of the A. F. of L., recently gave expression to a similar attitude in an editorial in the official publication of the union, namely *The Teamster*:

The old time bully who sat in a conference and wanted to lick everybody is to my mind one of the most objectionable creatures that we had in the early days of trade unionism.

The men of labor today are trained in a different kind of college, a college where they know and believe that we must win our fights with our brains, with our strategy, with our diplomacy, and not with the strong-armed bullying which prevailed 30 or 40 years ago.

I recently received a letter containing a request from one of the top economists in one of the largest institutions of learning in our country asking me to kindly answer the following questions:

What qualifications should be the out-

standing, foremost requirements for an official representative of labor; and, second, what are your requirements of an organizer or of any other representative under salary that you appoint to represent you or the International Union?

The questions are almost parallel. Regarding the second question as to my appointments, I require younger men now than we employed formerly. That is, a man with some experience in his local union or in his district anywhere from the age of twenty-five to thirty-five. It takes three or four years to train an organizer even if he has some experience as a local representative of labor.

But to answer the questions, the first requirement is honesty and sincerity. Second, his ability and a desire to improve his mind, an anxious, sincere, ambitious desire to learn. The third is personality, that is, one who can make friends even of his enemies. I don't mean that in making friends he should align himself or pledge his honor or bring suspicions on his actions in order to make friends with an undesirable, whether inside or outside the organization.

But what of the attitude of union members to abuses in their own unions? Suppose the union or their particular local is in the hands of racketeers or Communists, what should be the "Catholic" attitude to such a situation?

Three possible attitudes have been suggested in discussions of this problem. The first is, quit the union. The second is, stay in and do nothing. The third is, stay in there—and fight!

But the first solution looks like cowardice, leaving the forces of evil undisputed masters of the field. Besides, with about seventy-five per cent of American union men working under closed shop, union shop, or maintenance of membership conditions (as they are), to quit the union will mean to lose their

job. Not only cowardly, therefore, but also impractical.

The second solution is the way of least resistance, and speaking of union abuses, is a union abuse of the very first order. Apathy on the part of union members ("staying in but doing nothing") has often been precisely the reason why undesirable and immoral forces were able to take control of a union.

As a matter of fact, the Popes have so repeatedly insisted on the importance of union organization as a means to the welfare of individual workers and to general social reconstruction that it is definitely *not* the "Catholic" attitude to stay in and do nothing, except in the comparatively rare cases where absolutely nothing can be done.

A question might be asked here in parenthesis: what chance does an ordinary rank and file worker have, in sober reality, to make his voice heard or to get anywhere at all in the average American union? The question was actually put recently to a man well acquainted with the union situation. He limited his answer to the Chicago area, as being the one with which he was familiar at first hand. And it may be added that his answer is doubly interesting for the reason that the Chicago area is notorious throughout the country for the high-handed manner in which some union officials there handle union affairs and union members.

The answer was: an ordinary rank and file union member in the Chicago area can "do something", if he really wants to, in his union, as follows: if he belongs to an A. F. of L. union, in about 80 per cent of the cases; and if he belongs to a CIO union, in about 95 per cent of the cases.

The remaining five per cent, or twenty per cent, represents "union abuse". Let it be granted without argument. But let us also take note that it is still a

minority. Not all unions, even in the Chicago area, are run by high-handed racketeers — not even a majority of them!

And taking human nature as it is, can we consider this five per cent or twenty per cent as indicative of any particular degree of depravity on the part of the union members? What is the average degree of democratic control in American institutions? Take the case of American corporations, for instance. What per cent of the stockholders of American Telephone and Telegraph, or United States Steel, or General Motors, are in a position to "do something" in the corporation meetings? Eighty per cent, or ninety-five per cent, of the stockholders in these corporations are *not* in a position to influence the policies of the corporations: the very opposite of the condition of the rank and file members of labor unions, even in the Chicago area.

Or even take the United States Senate. A minority in that august body can and sometimes does obstruct the will of the majority. Any Senator can introduce legislation, but once introduced it must be approved by a committee of Senators before it can reach the floor of the Senate for deliberation; and if the small group of Senators on the committee refuses to approve the measure, it will never even come up for discussion, or "die in committee". Such was the case until fairly recently, at any rate; in January of this year some check was put on the power of this minority rule, "almost by a miracle", as some observers declared.

Such minority control in a professedly democratic body is an abuse, or at least is open to abuse (for no doubt there must be some such system of committees in the Senate for the sake of efficiency). Another far more serious abuse, however, is the device of the "filibuster"

—talk, talk, talk by a minority of Senators to keep a bill from coming to a vote when to all appearances it commands enough votes to pass.

Such a device is an abuse whether in the United States Senate or in a labor union meeting. The Communist brethren were adept at such abuses in union meetings to push their own minority views through despite the will of the majority. As is evident, however, the abuse is not confined to labor unions.

In fact, interestingly enough, the *CIO News* recently carried an account of a Communist attempt at such abuse in a union meeting which the rank and file defeated with a side-handed reference to the fact of the existence of this very abuse in the United States Senate. A leftist faction in the Furniture Workers' Union saw that the meeting was going against them, and if it came to a vote they would be defeated. So they attempted to stave off the vote by proposing that discussion of the matter be continued until a meeting to be held some months ahead. But the rank and file would have none of it. Cries rang through the hall: "Quit the stalling. . . . Vote! Vote! . . . *No filibustering!*" And the leftists were defeated by a landslide vote.

These rank and file unionists were examples of the third attitude: "Stay in there—and fight!"

It is true that such an attitude demands a great deal from union members. It would not be too much to say that it demands genuine heroism. Consider what it has meant in the past. To stick to their guns when it seemed a hopeless fight; when the Communist opposition had all the advantages, and was ready to use fair means or foul, and the foul just as easily as the fair, to gain their ends; when there was no glory whatever to be gained in the struggle, but only too often loss of

reputation by underhand smearing tactics, loss of union membership, loss of jobs, physical danger of being beaten up, and even death—to face these things was to take a stand against union abuses that was certainly nothing less than heroic.

And thousands of American unionists working "from the inside" have in the last ten years actually taken such a stand. Undaunted by hopeless odds, made even more determined by foul attacks on their reputations, their jobs, and even their lives, they stayed in there and fought, and now at last their persistent courage is reaping fruit. The abuse of Communist control is disappearing from unions all across the country.

Perhaps some day these heroes will receive credit from their fellow-Americans for what their victory means to American institutions. They have not received it, by and large, as yet; in fact, just the opposite.

Get the picture. In the nineteen-thirties the Communist attack on the United States centered to a very great extent on the labor unions. The unions had been marked out as the entering wedge, the spearhead for Communist seizure of power in the United States. Control of unions meant control of production, transportation, communications: control that could have brought the whole country to its knees and put the red flag over the White House.

Against this threat there rose the brave men who fought not in metropolitan newspapers; not in high places bedecked with flags and bunting and to the tune of stirring music; not with the plaudits of the crowd and national acclaim. They fought the good fight in union meeting halls, to the tune of foul-mouthed libel and slander on their good name and danger to life and limb; and when they issued forth

scarred with battle wounds received from unscrupulous foes, the very Americans whose security they were defending came out to meet them with jeers and further attacks.

"Unsung heroes"? They were sung, right enough, in the columns or broadcasts of pontifical labor reporters, and on the front pages of great newspapers, as dangerous radicals, un-American plotters against the common weal, criminals, degenerates, "goons". The very persons whose comfortable homes, big salaries, freedom and luxury were in the balance during those meetings in the union halls were the very ones to cover their defenders with opprobrium,

simply for the reason they were union men.

Perhaps some day, we say, the tide of public opinion will change and credit will be given where credit is due. Let us hope it will not be too late. Let us hope that in the struggles that lie ahead against union abuses "from the inside", the honest men who can still be heroes in the good fight, will not be discouraged by the abuses "from the outside", namely popular contempt for union men, and will not be deterred from doing what is surely the Catholic attitude on union abuses from the inside: "Stay in there—and fight!"

### *The Perfect Excuse*

His companions called him Tiny because he was so big. He was seventeen years old, a junior in high school and possessed of a presence and a personality not commonly found amongst the current crop of teen agers in the country. He would be a noted lawyer someday or a prosperous business man or a powerful politician.

Tiny's main fault in high school was his tardiness. Almost every morning he was a few minutes late. The other pupils would be seated in their class rooms when he would come drifting in, as though it were perfectly normal to arrive at that time and not at the time scheduled. The principal of the school was able to stand this idiosyncrasy only so long. One morning he called Tiny into his office and reprimanded him severely. In fact he told him that if he came late just once more, it would be the last time. He would have to leave school.

The next morning, five minutes after classes had started, in sauntered Tiny. As luck would have it he met the principal in the corridor. The principal's face grew red.

"Get out," he cried, pointing to the door. "Get out. You heard what I said yesterday. You promised to come on time; and here, you break your promise the very first day. Get out."

"Now, wait a minute," began Tiny. But he was not allowed to finish.

"Get out," bellowed the principal.

"You've got to hear me, I have an excuse. I'll put it in the form of a question. What would you do if you had six sisters in your family, and only one bath-room?"

Tiny remained in school.



## Three Minute Instruction

### The Lessons of Easter

The resurrection of Christ is a glorious reminder—one may call it a picture—of many of the essential and beautiful truths of the Catholic religion. Besides being the final proof of the divinity of Christ, it represents the transformation that will be effected in everyone who accepts Christ as a Redeemer and follows Him loyally throughout life.

1. It dramatically represents the elevation of human nature through grace. Christ's bruised, suffering and torn body on the cross, and His drained, lifeless, stiffened body in death, represents the unredeemed and sinful soul of man. His glorious risen body, shining like the sun, represents the soul of a man who has been redeemed. In being redeemed by Christ, a man is not only healed of the wounds of his sins; he is transformed into a new being, a being that participates in the beautiful nature of God, and shares the beauty of the risen Saviour.

2. It represents the important role that the body of man is to play in the sanctification and reward of his soul. The resurrection is the complete answer to all who have maintained that the body of man is in itself so corrupt and evil that it cannot ever share the grace that God gives to the soul. By glorifying His own body, Christ reaffirmed His teaching that the body of every man must both join with the soul in honoring and obeying God, and will be rewarded with it in a resurrection of its own.

3. It forcefully reveals the value of suffering. Human nature is so created that it can suffer cheerfully if it perceives a worthwhile goal to be attained through suffering. Christ reveals such a worthwhile goal—the only worthwhile goal—through His resurrection, which He offers to all who will share His suffering on the cross in small or great ways. Loneliness, heartache, sickness and death become bearable in peace in the measure in which the sufferer looks forward to a resurrection from the grave like Christ's.

These are thoughts to be carried away from Easter Sunday and to be cherished throughout the year. They are thoughts that support the Christian in every trial, even up to the final test of martyrdom.

# Readers Retort

In this section readers are invited to express disagreement with views and opinions published in *The Liguorian*. Long letters will be condensed, and names will not be used without permission.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

In *reel* life we Catholics must not see a picture dealing with the remarriage of divorced persons, or containing immoral incidents of any kind. However, in *real* life we have only to pick up the newspaper and right on the front page we will find a picture of a white-clad Sister hanging up a large sign to announce the birth of a son to the infamous Ingrid Bergman and her lover. Then we read on to find that the actual announcement was made to the world by a priest — friend and spiritual adviser of the father of the child. The result is that we must listen to the sneers and guffaws of our fellow office-workers and hear a young Catholic girl say: "Money can buy anything."

One remembers the series of articles in *The Liguorian* on the "Last Things", telling of wholesale apostasy to take place before the end of the world. And somehow one understands how much of it will happen. One won't be able to blame it all on the unbelievers, for did not Our Lord say: "I was wounded in the house of my friends"? I must say I feel quite wounded and much disillusioned . . .

I. W. A.

*This might be a good argument for not reading newspapers, which played up the Bergman-Rossellini scandal to a nauseating degree, but it is not a good argument against the duty of Catholic Sisters to take care of illegitimate babies, nor against a priest's giving advice to a sinful man. We recommend to all who feel like the above correspondent that they read carefully the article in this issue of The Liguorian "These Marriage Annulments" and also the Sideglances.*

*Because non-Catholics keep on repeating that money can buy anything from the Church does not make it true, nor should their sneers, which arise out of ignorance, disturb anyone who knows the truth and the facts.*

The Editors

Baltimore, Md.

It is not an explanation of an article in *The Liguorian* that I am seeking, but rather of an incident about which the entire world is curious, namely: the possibility of a Catholic marriage between Roberto Rossellini and Ingrid Bergman. Here is an excerpt from tonight's evening paper: "Miss Bergman has applied for a mail order divorce (get that — mail order divorce!) from her husband, Dr. Peter Lindstrom of Hollywood. Rossellini has already won a court annulment of his first marriage. An authoritative source said today that Rossellini is investigating the possibility of winning a Catholic annulment as well. That would make it possible for them to marry in the Catholic Church."

How will an annulment of his marriage make it possible for him to marry a divorcee, since the Church does not recognize divorce? In the fourth year of high school I was taught that the marriage of two non-Catholics was valid and though they sought and obtained a divorce, in the eyes of the Church they were still married . . . What loop-hole could possibly give Rossellini and Bergman the right to marry, unless the MONEY of both parties can be it? Another question: What are the reasons for the annulment of Rossellini's former marriage? Why can the rich afford to buy an annul-

## The Liguorian

ment? I realize he has not yet received the Church annulment, but the world knows it is to come. Has money ever failed since King Henry VIII of England? At present, I am 20 years of age, have always striven to be a good Catholic . . . There are millions like me, but if the Church does not refrain from granting these important people annulments, we little people will be so weakened in faith that some may fall from its graces.

M. M.

*It is sad to see Catholics permitting themselves to be tortured in this way, principally 1) because there are so many facts they have not yet learned, and 2) because they listen so naively to the ignorant and prejudiced who would sneer at the Church no matter what she did. Because the Bergman-Rossellini affair has been given so much publicity in the newspapers, many think that the whole structure of the Catholic Church will stand or fall on what it does about the case. As this is written, there is no evidence that the case will really be presented to the Church. If it is, it shall be judged according to the facts and according to nothing else, just as hundreds of other cases are decided every year. The article "These Marriage Annulments" in this issue of THE LIGUORIAN will add some necessary information to the high school lessons on divorce and annulment.*

The editors

Philadelphia, Pa.

Your instructive and interesting magazine is the best printed . . . It is with reluctance therefore that I offer the following suggestions and criticisms. The January, 1950, number (For Wives and Husbands Only) says: "Catholic doctors and nurses are taught in such cases immediately to immerse the foetus in water while breaking the covering around it." I have been present at quite a number of births and miscarriages and to the best of my knowledge have never seen a covering over a baby at any

state of development. Are you quite sure about immersion? I was taught to pour water on the head . . . while pronouncing the words "I baptize etc." If the subject were less important I would not presume to write this letter, but a technical error of this sort may weaken your aim, and to the unsympathetic is ludicrous. It would be a good idea if, when writing about physiology or anatomy, you would consult an authority on the subject . . .

B. M. R.

*Our correspondent is obviously not quite clear on the difference between a non-viable and viable foetus, and evidently has not been present at the miscarriage of a non-viable one. She is perfectly correct in the statement that the head must be baptized when the formation is clear, and when this is possible. As to the covering of a non-viable foetus and the process of immersion, a score of authors we have at hand could be quoted. It will be sufficient for anyone interested to read "Handbook of Medical Ethics," by Rochelle and Fink, published by the Newman Book Shop, Westminster, Maryland, pp. 218, 219. This handbook was written by priests in collaboration with a physician. On scientific matters readers may be sure that the editors of THE LIGUORIAN have a library of authorities to consult, as well as personal contact with experts in the field.*

The editors

Baltimore, Md.

Very likely, I was no more stunned than were you by that letter from Mrs. B. S., Baltimore, which you printed in the February *Liguorian*. My purpose in writing you is not to take issue with the lady. Probably the strongest argument we can offer her is our prayers rather than logic or doctrine or economics . . . It is possible, however, that her letter may again convince some of our fellow-Catholics that all business executives share her denunciation of the Church's teachings on social justice and of labor

## The Liguorian

unions. May I, as a vice-president of one of those "large corporations", assure our priests and my fellow-Catholics that many of us are sincerely interested in implementing the teachings of the Church — that we must be as submissive to Her pronouncements regarding social justice as to marriage or any other moral law. If you publish this, please do not use my initials, except that if Mrs. B. S. wants to know, you may give her my full name and address . . .

N. N.

*We hope this letter will be read by many.*

*The editors*

Newport, R. I.

May one, who loves life but looks forward with joy to the greater Life which comes after, take up the subject of "Atom Bomb Neurosis" touched upon in the December issue of *The Liguorian*? It is not our personal or material security which is in danger, so much as the spiritual life of this generation — a generation which has coined a new word — genocide. The atomic bomb and germ warfare are both genocide weapons.

We seem to have slipped morally to an

alarming extent. The annihilation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were perpetrated at the close of the war and were unjustifiable even on military grounds. Our present vast appropriations for the development and manufacture of atom bombs and other genocide weapons equally barbarous prove that their use has been fully considered. The intent is deliberate, even with the slightly saving clause of "retaliatory measure". In a democracy such matters are the responsibility of each citizen . . . When we assume the honor of being the first to ban the use of such weapons it will relieve tension and do much to pave the way to Peace. This would be part of that "strict obligation" "to exert every influence we possess to prevent wars and man-made catastrophes", the words with which you so beautifully point out our duty in the closing paragraph.

Ruth Thomas

*We heartily wish it were possible to do something about these tremendous problems. Maybe THE LIGUORIAN's primary effort to help people save their souls, become happy, and attain holiness, is as effective a means as there is at hand.*

The editors

## Generosity Among Catholics

The Milwaukee Archdiocesan *Herald-Citizen* points out some interesting instances of sizeable gifts made to charity recently by men of wealth, which are all the more noteworthy because of the high income and inheritance taxes which threaten to wash out or prevent the building of large estates.

On the anniversary of their son's death two years ago, former Ambassador and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy presented \$600,000 to the Archbishop of Boston for the Convalescent Home for Children in Brighton. Last week an additional \$125,000 was given the home and \$160,000 to St. Coletta's School for Exceptional Children.

In Texas Mr. Hugh R. Cullen, who made a gift of \$350,000 for the new pediatric wing of St. Joseph's Infirmary, will also assume the entire operating cost of the building over a period of years.

In Chicago last year Mr. Frank Lewis, at a meeting of the Extension Society, distributed \$100,000 among needy dioceses, the latest in a series of benefactions by this noted Catholic layman.



## *Character Test (83)*

*L. M. Merrill*

### **On Scrupulosity**

A great trial to their friends and acquaintances (to say nothing of themselves) are people who suffer from the disease of religious scrupulosity. In some cases the affliction has grown to a point where it can rightly be called a mental disease, and one for which the best possible treatment seems incapable of effecting a cure.

But there are many more cases in which scrupulosity could be controlled and eventually cured by a victim willing to take the stern measures required. A scrupulous person is one whose judgment about sin—his own personal sins—has been weakened and even perverted, and whose will refuses to seek or accept the means of correcting his perverted judgment.

Thus, the scrupulous person worries about past sins; he worries about present temptations as if they were sins; he worries about venial sins as if they were mortal, and about confessed sins as if they were improperly confessed and not forgiven. On all these matters the normal human mind is capable of making correct judgments; if, as a result of some past mind-scarring experience, or some temperamental instability, or some improper training and instruction, a person's mind finds itself confused and incapable of making right judgments, then the will must be employed in these three ways:

1. To accept without argument the diagnosis of scrupulosity made by a confessor. The most formidable obstacle to the cure of scruples is the refusal of victims to assent to the decision of a confessor. It is strange that many a scrupulous person knows that he is not making right judgments about sin, and yet will cling to the thought that his confessor is not making a right judgment about him. No scrupulous person can be cured until he learns to say simply, on the authority of his confessor: "I am scrupulous."

2. To obey without questioning what he is told to do or not to do, to say or not to say, to repeat or not to repeat. Even if a directive given seems to be folly, useless, or above all, sinful, the scrupulous person must obey. Knowing that his own judgment in the matter of sin is warped, he must bind his obedience to his confessor.

3. To fling himself with childlike confidence on the goodness and love of God. He must be convinced that God wants no one to go through the agonizing tortures of unchecked scrupulosity. At the very outset of such torture he should make an act of love of God and put his worries away, knowing that God cannot resist expressions of love from His creatures.

## Troubadour of God

The fool who became the inspiration of millions, and the symbol of happiness in poverty. It was a leper who started him on his way.

*H. J. O'Connell*

"THE FOOL! The fool! Make way for the fool!"

The cry of the pack of urchins sounded through the steep, narrow streets of Assisi, and rebounded from the close-set, rust-colored walls of the houses. Citizens, looking on with tolerant amusement, saw, tottering along the street, a strange figure, emaciated, hollow-eyed, with the rags of once fine clothing clinging to his thin limbs. At his heels ran the rabble of boys, hurling their taunts, as well as stones and bits of rotting garbage at his silent, unprotesting form.

In the shop of Pietro Bernardone, cloth-merchant of the town, a clerk leaned languidly out the window as the strange procession neared. Then his body stiffened with surprise and excitement, while his eyes grew wide with unbelief. "God save us! It's Master Francis!" he cried out. Rushing back to the rear of the shop, he tugged at the sleeve of the owner. "Your son!" he gasped. "Your son is outside with a group of boys throwing stones at him!"

Pietro dropped the bale of cloth he was holding, and raced to the door. It was as the clerk had said. There, ragged and dirty, smeared with the filth of the way, mocked at by street-urchins, was his son Francis, once so debonair and gay, the pride of his house, the hope of the future of his name.

Like a wild man, the merchant shoved aside the crowd, raining blows and curses right and left. The boys fled before his wrath, and he was left alone

with his son. Without a word, Pietro grasped the young man by the collar, and pushed him before him into the house. Downstairs, in a dark cellar-room, he hurled him, exhausted, almost senseless, upon the floor. Then, turning the key in the lock, the father went upstairs to bury his head in his hands, and wonder what kind of madness had come over his son.

•

He thought over the years that had passed since, twenty-five years before, the glad news was brought him that he had a son. What a bright, lovable child Francis had been, ever bubbling with the light-hearted gaiety of his French mother! How proud the father had been when his boy first began to help about the shop! He was sharp enough at it, too, knowing well the value of the various bales of cloth, and how to get a good price for them. Oh, it was true that he was a bit extravagant; but that was the French in him. He wanted money only to use for gay parties and fine clothes, not to store up in the careful Italian way. What a dandy he had been! The finest cloth in the shop went to make Francis' clothes, and they were always cut in the latest fashion. Would he had still some of that light-hearted foolishness, reflected the father, rather than the religious madness that had taken hold of him in the last few years. Well, he'd stay down in the cellar until he got some sense. No more of this shaming his family in the public streets.

Down in his dark room, Francis knelt

## The Liguorian

and prayed. He was, indeed, saddened by the anger and grief of his father; but he could not go back now to the frivolous ways of his youth. All his life the dream of greatness had been his. At first, he had misunderstood, thinking that this greatness lay for him in a soldier's life. Twice already he had gone off to win glory in battle. But God's grace, which had long been knocking at his heart, had of late made clear the path he was to tread. The ideal of perfect holiness had captured his soul. He must walk in the steps of Christ along the road of poverty and self-denial, though it cost him his father's love and all the world besides.

The turning point in his life, as it has been for so many noble souls, was a period of sickness which had laid him low at the age of twenty-two. During his long convalescence, lying in bed, or on a cot in the sunshine with a view of the beautiful Umbrian hills and plains, he had time to think. The uselessness of the frivolous life he had been leading came home to him with compelling force. What did such pleasures bring a man but remorse and uneasiness of heart? How little did these things seem when measured against the eternal years!

Then had come the vision. Thinking that the way to his dreamed-of greatness lay in dedicating himself to a splendid cause, he resolved to go on the Crusade against the Turks, and fight for Christendom beneath the banner of the renowned Walter de Brienne. He was already on the way, when another attack of fever brought him again to bed. One day, as he lay there half asleep, he heard a voice asking:

"Francis, whither goest thou?"

"To Apulia, to be a knight," he answered.

"Tell me, Francis," the voice said,

"who can benefit you most: the Lord or the servant?"

"The Lord," responded Francis in surprise.

"Then why do you desert the Lord for the servant, the Prince for His vassal?"

Francis recognized Who it was that spoke to him, and cried out in the words of St. Paul:

"Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?"

"Go back to your home," the voice came; "there you will be told what you are to do."

Again one night, when he had dropped behind a group of friends with whom he was walking, the Lord visited him. Suddenly, there in the street, he was transported out of himself, feeling such sweetness as he had never known. At that moment, as he later said, though he had been cut limb from limb, he would not have been conscious of it. In the light which flooded his soul, he beheld at once his own lowliness and the shining beauty of the only true and noble life—the life in Jesus Christ. One of his friends came back to look for him, and, seeing the rapture on his face, said jokingly:

"Why Francis, are you thinking of your honeymoon?"

"Yes, I am thinking of marrying," the young man answered. "But the bride I am going to wed is nobler, richer far than any woman you know."

From that moment Francis was fairly launched on the way to holiness. He took to lurking in the caves outside the city, or in the ruined shrines that dotted the fields, spending his days in prayer and penance. Once, he walked on foot to Rome, and, having traded his fine garments for a poor man's rags, took his place with the crowd of beggars before St. Peter's, "that he might know

what it was to beg his bread."

However, the opportunity for his greatest victory over self came through a leper, one of those unfortunates who used to wait along the roadside in medieval times, asking pity from the passers-by. Francis had always had an instinctive horror of leprosy. Generous as he had always been with the poor, he could not bring himself to give an alms to a leper unless someone would take it for him. The very sight of the lepers' hospital outside the city-walls turned his stomach. When forced to pass it, he always did so with averted face and fingers in his nostrils to keep out the sickening smell.

One day, he was riding his horse over the Umbrian plain, when he saw beside the road the hideous figure of a leper. Again the usual nausea seized him. But the Lord had said to him in prayer:

"Francis, everything which you have loved and desired in the flesh it is your duty to despise and hate, if you wish to know My Will. And when you have begun thus, all that which now seems to you sweet and lovely will become intolerable and bitter; but all which you used to avoid will turn itself to great sweetness and exceeding joy."

Here in this leper Francis beheld that which his flesh most abhorred. Now was the time, he reflected, to take the Lord at His word, now the time to conquer self completely. Springing from his horse, he approached the sick man and placed an alms in the outstretched hand. Then, stooping down, though his body was racked with revulsion, he kissed the fingers that were covered with the loathsome disease. Mounted again upon his horse, he scarce knew where he was. For, according to the promise made to him, Francis' soul was filled to overflowing with a sweet gladness, such as he had never experienced in all the gay gatherings of his friends.

Now, more than ever, he betook himself to the hillside caves, spending the days and nights in converse with God. No longer did he pay attention to his person. His beard grew long; his fine garments turned into tatters; his face became hollow-eyed and haggard from fasting; and in his eyes gleamed a strange light, as of one who has looked on another world.

It was when he was returning from one of these long sojourns in the fields that the incident occurred which awoke his father's violent anger. The boys of the town, seeing how strange and wild he looked, took him for fair game, and followed him through the streets with their mockery and abuse to the very door of the Bernardone shop. Pietro had long been opposed to what he considered his son's excessive piety. But this public shame led him to violent action. Francis was locked in the cellar, there to stay with nothing but bread and water as his fare, until he got some sense into his head.

However, Pietro was often forced to leave the city on business affairs. While he was gone, Francis' mother, who could not bear to think of him in that dark underground cell, seized the chance to set him free. Once more, he made for his favorite haunt in the hillside cave outside the city.

When the father returned, he was enraged to find that his son had gone back to the same mad ways. This time, he resolved, he would see the matter through to the end. He would take the matter to court with a view to disinheriting his son, and procuring his banishment from the locality. Being a man of influence, Pietro without difficulty got his way with the authorities. A writ was issued, and a messenger sent to arrest Francis and bring him before the court.

## The Liguorian

However, when the young man was eventually found, an unforeseen difficulty threatened to upset Pietro's plan. To the summons Francis replied:

"By the grace of God I am now a free man, and not obliged to appear before the court. For I am the servant only of God Most High."

This answer signified that he had entered the ecclesiastical state, and hence by privilege was immune from the secular court, and subject only to the tribunal of the Church.

Not to be balked, Pietro carried his case before the bishop. In due time, father and son were brought together before his Lordship. Pietro stated his side of the question, and demanded that Francis return all goods and money belonging to his father. The bishop, whose sympathy was evidently with the ideals of the son, rather than the greed of the father, turned to the young man and said:

"Francis, if you desire to serve God, give his money back to your father. Perhaps it has been obtained by unjust means, and therefore should not be used for the benefit of the Church."

Standing up, with tear-filled eyes, Francis answered:

"My Lord, not only will I give him the money cheerfully, but also the very clothes I have received from him."

Swiftly, he disappeared into an adjoining room. Then to the amazement of all, he reappeared clad only in a hair-shirt, with the fine suit he had donned that day hanging upon his arm. Walking over to his father, he laid the suit, together with all the money he possessed, at his feet. Looking up to heaven, he solemnly exclaimed:

"Listen, all of you, to what I have to say! Hitherto I have called Pietro Bernardone father. Now I return to him his money and all the clothes I got from him, so that hereafter I shall not say: 'Father Pietro Bernardone', but 'Our Father Who art in Heaven!'"

It was at this dramatic moment that Francis of Assisi began that practice of perfect poverty which brought him such gladness of heart as those who love wealth can never know, a joy of spirit which led him to go singing across the Umbrian hills the songs that made him known as "the Troubadour of God."

## The Saints John

The Johns who are saints are so abundant that most of them had to be given distinguishing sobriquets of one kind or another, with such pleasing results as St. John in the Well, St. John the Skipper (one would like to have known *him!*), St. John the Mower, St. John the Hairy, St. John the Woman-hater (one would not care so much to have known *him*), St. John Who Saw an Angel, St. John the Despot (nor *him*), St. John the Dwarf, St. John of the Grating, etc. Of the fifty martyrs under Henry VIII sixteen were Johns to ten Thomases and four Richards, the next most numerous names.

*From "A Procession of Saints" by James Broderick, S.J.*

## The Philosopher Says

Some people are in debt because they spend what their friends think they make.

Some people with open minds should have them closed for repairs.

One way to kill time is by working it to death.

# Public Libraries on Spain

Almost every adult American has some opinion about the Spanish Civil War that brought Franco into power. That the opinions are often foolish ones may be explained in part by this article.

*J. Higgins*

TEN YEARS now, man and boy, off and on, personally and through the courtesy and kindness of others, I have been rooting in the public libraries' card indexes, or, if you are a pedant, indices. I have been looking under the heading "Spain, Civil War, 1936".

The number of libraries investigated came, in the grand total, to twenty-four, a kindly but substantial number, divisible, I am told, by two. This arbitrary and unpremeditated number was the result of several unrelated factors. For one thing, the number of people who can be imposed upon to search libraries for you is, in these degenerate days, not large. For another, the Guggenheim Foundation provided no funds for indiscriminate travel. The research had to be done in connection with travel for other purposes.

Geographically, however, the libraries surveyed range from San Francisco and Los Angeles, the gentle misty slopes of the Pacific, to Somerville, Massachusetts, which was as close as I could get to the rock-bound coasts of Maine. (This was penned during the octave of the 4th of July.) In between, we sampled Saratoga Springs, New York; San Antonio, Texas; Grand Rapids, Michigan; Tulsa, Oklahoma; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Lima, Ohio; Kansas City, Missouri; Salt Lake City, Utah; Cheyenne, Wyoming; Chickasha, Oklahoma; Watertown and Madison, Wisconsin. It is, I believe, a fair sampling of these more or less United States.

In the libraries searched (exclusive of

Madison and Watertown, Wisconsin), there was a total of 93 different books on the Spanish Civil War.

Of these 93 books there are 21 about which I cannot learn anything as to their sympathies or viewpoints. That leaves 72 books. All conclusions that are drawn here are based on the character and distribution of these books throughout the public libraries.

Only 34 of these 72 books seem to have any widespread influence on public opinion as generated through public libraries. For only 34 of the books listed were accepted by five or more of the libraries visited. Considering only this group of 34 widely accepted books, the loyalists did considerably better than their opponents in the battle for space on the public library shelf, maintaining a better than three to one lead. Twenty-three of these books that Mr. George Spelvin, American, is likely to encounter on his public library shelf are frankly loyalist (which, for those who have forgotten, was the Communist side), while only seven are sympathetic to the nationalists (the side of General Franco). In some libraries the disproportion is even more marked. The library of Watertown, Wisconsin, (pop. 15,000), has six offerings on the subject, all loyalist. Madison, Wisconsin, (pop. 100,000) has 37 books on the subject, all but three or four of which are sympathetic to the loyalist cause.

Surprisingly enough, the individual book that won its way into the largest number of libraries was on the whole

sympathetic to the nationalists, and its appendix on the alleged nationalist massacre of loyalists at Badajoz was most devastating to the loyalists. It is Major G. Moss's *Siege of the Alcazar*, a worthy treatment of a true epic. The story, it may be remembered, was this: On hearing of General Franco's uprising in North Africa, a group of sympathizers to the cause he represented, together with their families, barricaded themselves in the fortress-like military school called the Alcazar at Toledo in Spain, and heroically held out against the loyalists attacks, bombings and dynamiting, until a nationalist column raised the siege. It was during this siege that the attackers, the loyalists, murdered the son of the Alcatraz commander because the commander would not surrender the fortress in exchange for his son's life. The reviews selected for the *Book Review Digest* of this work praise its objectivity, but are silent on the author's investigation of the Badajoz incident. It is customary for anti-Franco writers to refer to Badajoz as the place where Franco massacred several thousand people huddled together in a bull ring. Moss presents ample evidence to show that the massacre was the creation of a free lance journalist.

Only five of the libraries explored had Arnold Lunn's *Spanish Rehearsal*. Probably the librarians were scared off by the reviewer in the *Saturday Review of Literature* who wrote off Lunn's work as "an attempt to force the whole tragedy within the framework of his narrow and dogmatic thesis." It seems strange now that it was possible only a short ten years ago thus to smile superiorly at Lunn's thesis: that a weak Popular Front government will first shake hands with the Russian Bear and then be crushed to death by it. As one country after another has gone down before the crusher, Lunn's books ought to become

popular as prophecy.

Knoblauch's *Correspondent in Spain* made only seven libraries. As correspondent for the Associated Press until forced to leave by the Madrid (loyalist) government because of the frankness of his reports, he had an excellent opportunity to see and describe the loyalist censorship and propaganda mill at work.

*Spain, a Tragic Journey*, by F. T. Rogers, was received into only four libraries. Rogers is a Philippine journalist, with a knowledge of both the Spanish and Catalan languages, who journeyed through both the red and white zones in 1937. Originally, most of his friends were middle-class republicans. But with them he came to see that the socialists, anarchists and communists were the ones who had killed the republic and set up in its place a reign of terror and tyranny.

If our poll is any guide, American libraries still have to hear of *Spanish Arena*, by Foss and Gerahty, a pro-nationalist work by two Englishmen, which undertakes to answer the questions of most interest arising out of the conflict: the causes of the war, the role of foreign powers, the popular support of the insurgents, the role of the Church, atrocities, Guernica, Badajoz, International Brigades, the Basques, latifundia. And although six libraries can lend you the *Spanish Tragedy* of Professor Peers, an acknowledged authority on Spain, not one of them could let you see his work, *Spain, the Church, and the Orders*, in which he examines and disproves the charge, cherished so dearly by all fellow-travellers, that the Catholic Church and clergy in Spain were swollen with wealth.

Salvador de Madariaga's *Spain* (revised 1943 edition) is an objective account of the events leading up to the Civil War, by a scholar who held the chair of Spanish studies at Oxford. Only one library in the survey had this book.

One brave man, a well known inter-

national lawyer, P. Crabites, wrote a book called *Unhappy Spain*, in which he dealt with the role played by the Freemason lodges in Spanish politics. And one library took it.

Five libraries bought—or were given—Harold Cardozo's *March of a Nation*. Cardozo, a special correspondent for the London *Daily Mail*, also proves that the so called Badajoz atrocity of the nationalists was a fiction.

Speaking for the loyalists, Elliott Paul, with his *Life and Death of a Spanish Town*, found the most favor with our librarians. He is an American journalist who lived on the Balearic Islands for five years. He is only mildly pro-loyalist, conceding that the Republic had some faults. He is also only mildly interesting. Thirteen of the libraries took his book.

Eleven libraries bought Alvarez del Vayo's *Freedom's Battle*. Vayo is a Communist and was one of the Madrid (loyalist) government's foreign ministers. His purpose is to minimize the Russian influence in his government, and he has carried on manfully for the Communists from Mexico.

Ramon J. Sender, a Spanish Communist intellectual, wrote his account of the struggle under the title *Counter-attack in Spain*. In his picture the Popular Front was a chivalric effort to destroy feudalism. There was no intention, says he, of establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat. The war was started by the reactionaries, there was no Communist plot, terrorism was brought in by Franco's forces, the loyalists were activated only by respect for law, clean morality, and the militarists bought foreign armies with pieces of national territory. Ten libraries will give you this dish of whitewash to gulp down.

Leland Stowe, who was one of the best cheer-leaders the loyalists had, sends off our next number with this hur-

rah: "H. L. Matthews' *Two Wars and More to Come* is most forceful and honestly partisan." Matthews regards the whole conflict as simply the uprising of the masses against injustice. Here is one of his gems: "As late as 1931 the Jesuits controlled about one third of the national wealth." (p. 74) Another gem: "The world was properly horrified (at the burning of churches and killing of monks and nuns) but it made the mistake of thinking of it as an invention of the reds. Really, it is an old Spanish custom." Nine libraries taught people with this trash.

If only because it has a preface by Jacques Maritain, Mendizabal's *Martyrdom of Spain* is a cut above anything we have mentioned so far. While hardly to be classed as pro-loyalist, it is assuredly anti-nationalist. Mendizabal was a professor of philosophy of Law at Oviedo and he deals profoundly with the causes of the war. When he deals with the question of what choice the patriotic Christian Spaniard should make in the situation that arose in 1936, he is not clear or convincing. Eight libraries list it.

Eight libraries took A. Bessie's *Men in Battle*, an account of the International Brigade, probably because Vincent Sheean and Clifton Fadiman led the claue in enthusiastic approval.

Another account of war-time services with the loyalists rests on seven of the library shelves. It is *Patrol is Ended*, by H. De Wet, a young English flyer and mercenary. Six libraries have the story of an American flyer, *Some Still Live*, by F. G. Tinker. He fought for "democracy" at 18,000 pesetas, ten times the prevailing rate for a 2nd lieutenant.

Langdon-Davies' *Behind the Spanish Barricades* was a very popular Marxist presentation, though only six libraries had it. He assumed without question the

unqualified success of Communism in Russia.

Three books by Catholics that are forthrightly anti-Franco are: *Diary of My Times* by Bernanos, *Burgos Justice* by Ruiz Vilaplana, and *Escape Via Berlin* by Aguirre, a leader of the Basque separatists who adhered to the Popular Front in exchange for a promise of Basque autonomy.

My conclusions from this investigation are as follows:

1) It may be that this study fails to give a completely just picture of what the American public library offers on the Spanish Civil War because of the fact that the survey extended over a period of ten years. Some libraries examined at the beginning of the period may have remedied the top-heavy pro-loyalist list.

2) The better than three-to-one pro-loyalist preponderance does not mean that librarians are agents of the Kremlin. It is simply another indication of the American intellectual captivity, during the past ten years, at the hands of fellow-travellers in important segments of the book publishing and book reviewing trade. The Communist line, in an unscrupulous simplification, presented the Spanish struggle as a battle between de-

mocracy and fascism, and the Party's friends and/or dupes spread this gospel tirelessly and without regard for cost.

3) The big city libraries, with larger budgets, had more balanced offerings.

4) Some middle and small sized towns defy all rational understanding as to how they make up their lists. One prosperous town (pop. 5000), a city of churches, retired farmers and other equally solid citizens, will give you one, and only one book on the Spanish Civil War, and this condition is reported as of today. One of the authors of the book is a writer for the *Daily Worker*, New York Communist newspaper. The result is a work that has no regard for either the facts of history or the telling of the truth. Another but larger town, equally prosperous and endowed with churches, has nothing on its library shelves regarding the Spanish Civil War that does not reflect the Communist line.

5) As a remedy, I suggest that those interested in the truth, and in getting the truth across to their fellow citizens, buy E. Allison Peers' *Spanish Tragedy*, the same author's *Spain, the Church and the Orders*, and *Spanish Arena* by Foss and Gerahty, and present them to their public libraries.

### Taking a Bow For God

John R. Sizoo, in his book *Preaching Unashamed*, describes this incident as taking place on a trip that he and his wife made to Rome. Of course they visited St. Peter's church, and after walking around its spacious interior for a time, the noted educator took up his stand before the high altar in order that he might cast his eyes around the whole building from that vantage point.

As he stood there, other visitors came up the aisles, and as they passed before Mr. Sizoo, many of them bowed profoundly, and he of course returned the bows with much gratification.

This went on for some time, until finally his wife, who had been off in a side chapel, came up and, taking him by the arm, drew him away. Then he noticed that people continued to bow—to the tabernacle and the cross above it.

"John," his wife whispered to him, "you have been suffering from an omnipotent complex."

# Snobs of Democracy

A snob is one who considers himself better than his equals. All men are equal in the sight of God, but not in the sight of the snob.

*E. F. Miller*

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY is full of snobs. What I mean is this. American democracy is like charity; in a certain sense it may be said that it is charity. People praise both to the skies in speeches, poetry and magazine articles. They love them very much in the abstract. But when it comes to the point of treating fairly the Jew who lives next door or the Negro who takes it upon himself to eat at the next table in the restaurant, both democracy and charity often go flying out the window. Americans make the most noise about democracy, but almost every community in America has its coterie of snobs.

Many of the daily papers recently carried an item about an American soldier of Mexican descent who was killed in action in Europe and whose body was being brought home, to a southern city, for reburial. He was refused a grave in the cemetery where "white" people were buried. The white sepulchres who made the decision against the "tainted" dust of the Mexican boy, and in favor of the buried bones of the "master" race which was white, had no more democracy than hypocrites or Hitler. The southern cities that set up even cemeteries on discriminatory lines are a long distance removed from democracy in the real sense of the word.

Northern Americans are just as illogical and just as undemocratic. What chance did the Japanese-American heroes have of receiving the benefits of democracy when they returned from

the war during which so many of their companions were killed? The bodies of Japanese-Americans were refused a place of burial in Chicago cemeteries. The German military dead were not treated that harshly by American soldiers while the war was still going on. In the beautiful Third Division cemetery on the Anzio beachhead the fallen Germans were placed in rows right next to the American dead. As far as I know no American turned over in his grave because of the awful sacrilege.

In a Catholic parish "up north" the colored janitor of the parish school was offered a house by the pastor directly across the street from the rectory. This man was a good man in every respect, clean in appearance, charitable in action, dependable in his work. As soon as the "respectable" citizens of the section heard that there was a possibility of a colored man and his family moving into their neighborhood, they drew up a petition to keep him out. The man, his wife and children had to remain in the wretched, slummy Harlem of the city where he would be properly kept in his place. The master race spoke again. He had been seriously thinking of becoming a Catholic. Perhaps he still is. If so, it is not because of the wonderful democracy of his fellow Americans. It may be that no Catholic signed the petition. Even so, the Catholics, with their sublime notions of charity and their traditional love for democracy, should have signed a counter petition against the first petition. If

some of the Catholics did sign the original petition, it is difficult to understand how they could approach the Communion railing with a good conscience. To place the value of property above the value of a human being is not something that is thought of lightly by Our Lord who gave up His life for *all* people, the black as well as the white.

This community, of course, is characterized by much flag-waving, band-playing and speech-giving on the glories of democracy. And if a stranger impugned the democracy of its citizens, he would be throttled into a piece of pulp before he could explain what he meant.

Until the Negro is treated like an equal, at least in the opportunities afforded him, and not like a clown or a slave whose only name is Sambo or Mammy or "that nigger", all talk of democracy should be banished from the land. Talk about democracy and actions against democracy are means of propaganda for the Communists; and true propaganda too. In some respects we are little better than the Communists. They are forever using such democratic terms as peoples' courts, peoples' governments, and so forth. Yet, not even a shred of democracy exists wherever the hammer and the sickle become the symbol of the current authority. We love to talk about democracy too. But if a man is a Catholic, he cannot be president of the country. If a man is a Negro, he cannot, in many places, even be a citizen in the same sense as a white man. If a man is a member of a union, particularly a coal union, he is an enemy, trying to destroy the country. If a child attends a parochial school, he is cut off from the benefits of the taxes that his parents pay for the educational welfare of the nation at large. If a man is a Jew, he is by that very fact suspect of all kinds of treachery and double-

dealing. If this be democracy, it is not the democracy that the founding fathers wrote into the constitution.

A newscast has been making the rounds of the theatres lately in which a woman who had something to do with the war-crimes trials in Germany was interviewed. She was asked whether there is any repentance on the part of the Germans for their part in starting the recent terrible war. Without explanation or elaboration she simply stated that there is no sense of sorrow at all amongst the Germans. She gave the impression that all Germans are hardened in evil, cruel, incapable of remorse, and quite smug in their satisfaction at having come out of the war alive. She made all Germans look like barbarians and fools. It was another example of the undemocratic spirit amongst democratic Americans. Anybody with the smallest degree of intelligence knows that there are countless Germans who were no more responsible for the war than the Indians of Oklahoma. Everybody knows that there are saints amongst the Germans as there are saints amongst other nationalities. All of us should know that the Germans in general are no better and no worse than we are ourselves. Democracy should move us to that conviction. Democracy should make us act according to that conviction.

There can never be true democracy in our country until the people have learned the meaning of supernatural charity. Democracy is charity in action—loving and treating the neighbor as oneself out of love for God. And there will never be supernatural charity on a large scale until the true religion, which reveals the mind of God concerning charity, and gives strength through grace to fallen nature to abide in practice by that revelation, prevails throughout the land. If this is bigotry, so be it.

## *The Liguorian*

It is pure nonsense to speak of the unimportance of good works, such as charity, for the pleasing of God, which foolishness we are hearing from a thousand Protestant pulpits these days.

Why should a man practice charity, or democracy, if it does not make any difference to God whether he practices the virtue or not, provided he has faith in God? Hitler had some kind of faith in God even though, for him, both faith and God were on the vague side. Scamps and scoundrels by the score have faith too. But their very actions prove them to be most uncharitable and undemocratic. False religion can destroy democracy as quickly as dictators and tyrants.

No, there will be no true democracy in America or in any other country until charity takes over. And there is no institution that can adequately tell the world what true charity is except the institution that Christ set up to speak in His name. Our Lord said, "Whatsoever you do to these, my least

brethren, you do unto Me." Our Lord's Church interprets the words "my least brethren" as meaning the sick, the laborer, the poor, the unwashed, the Negro, the Mexican, even the Catholic and the Jew. And, of course, they embrace the Germans and the Russians. Kindness and the dispensing of equal rights to them is kindness and the dispensing of equal rights to Christ.

But the problem is not so much to find out what supernatural charity is as it is to develop the strength to practice supernatural charity. Here the Church that Christ founded really functions as only one, given a share in God's power, can function. She has the Sacraments, the Mass. And with these instruments of divine omnipotence, she produces saints. Saints alone are completely charitable. Saints alone are true democrats. And every man can be a saint through the ministrations of the religion of Christ. Thus, every man, if he so desires, can be a democrat in the sense of a practitioner of democracy.

### *Fool's Fears*

Of future wars and atom bombs,  
His dread is awful,  
And yet he seems unworried by  
His deeds unlawful.

He fears that Communists will soon  
Engulf the nation;  
That he is bent for hell evokes  
No trepidation.

Of homes destroyed by tyrant's hand  
He oft discourses;  
Although he's broken three himself  
By three divorces.

He spends his life in fearing things  
Someone might do him;  
While doing things himself that he'll  
Forever rue him.

LFFH

# BIBLICAL PROBLEMS (31)

E. A. Mangan

## The Serpent that Tempted Eve

*Problem:* Exactly what happened when the devil tempted Eve, as recorded in the first chapter of Genesis? Was there a real serpent there and did he talk?

*Solution:*

1. It is certain that we must hold that the devil was there and that Eve underwent a real temptation instigated by the devil. This is clear from the whole story as it unfolds; moreover, the Roman Biblical Commission has rendered a decision on this matter that all Catholics must accept.

2. The devil could have used a real serpent as an instrument of seduction. God could have permitted this, just as He later allowed the devils to enter the swine in one of the Gospel stories. Many Scriptural interpreters of note have held and do hold this opinion.

3. Satan could have assumed the external form of a serpent. If this opinion is held, it means that there was no real serpent, but that the devil assumed the form of something that looked like a serpent to Eve. God could permit this, just as He often permitted angels to appear on earth in the form of men. The Holy Spirit Himself was to appear in the form of a dove. This view would explain perhaps better than the preceding one, why, in verse 14 of chapter 3 of Genesis, only the serpent is punished. The serpent is not only an instrument of Satan, but it is Satan himself.

4. Some interpreters hold that the serpent mentioned is merely a symbol used by the sacred author to express more fittingly the diabolical temptation. According to this opinion, there was nothing external that Eve could see. She merely experienced a temptation that was instigated by the devil, and this temptation was so subtle and serpentine in its unfolding that the author used the idea of a serpent to express it. Can this opinion be squared with the decision of the Biblical Commission, which says that we must hold there was a temptation by the devil "under the form of a serpent"? Some authors think so. The temptation was "serpent-like", they say.

Personally, I do not see how this opinion can be condemned. The fact that there was an actual temptation and that it was from the devil is not denied. Symbolism is often used in Holy Scripture, even by Our Lord Himself.

5. If this last opinion is held, then there was no actual talking between Eve and the serpent-devil. The conversation recorded is simply a psychological event symbolically told, of the origin and progress of the temptation which Eve experienced.

# Educational Folly

"Church and State" has nothing to do with it. The point is: Children have to be led to God or they may go to the devil.

*L. G. Miller*

ONE OF THE strangest fixations of our time is the conviction rooted in the consciousness of many educational leaders which leads them to strive for a complete separation between education and moral training. Knowledge of the multiplication table, it seems to us, is rather barren ground for the production of good citizens. A recent news dispatch indicates that in Italy, at least, the government feels the same way.

This news dispatch reported a speech made by Prime Minister De Gasperi at the closing session of the Italian national convention of schools. Mr. De Gasperi stated his conviction that "formation of the pupils' moral conscience is the main accomplishment the state expects of the schools, because moral conscience is an absolute necessity for the democratic state." After referring to the fact that there are many in the educational world who think differently, he went on to say: "No one in Italy can say that there is a more efficacious morality than that of the gospel of brotherhood and the common fatherhood of God, Who is at the same time Judge and Father. Nor can anyone say that there is a more efficacious system for forming the consciences of the young."

This seems obvious enough to any right-thinking person, but the strange fact is that here in the United States, public education, as by law established, not only ignores the principle but is opposed to it. Since the celebrated Supreme Court decision in the *McCollum* case, it is in a measure a civil

offense to mention the ten commandments of God in an Illinois public school. And any other state which wants to know the position of the federal government has only to submit a similar case.

This means, according to declared government policy, that during the six or eight hours a day given over to the formal education of a child during its primary and high school years, there must be not the slightest attempt made to tie in that education with some idea of moral restraint and moral motivation in conduct. Surely that is not to exaggerate the meaning of the law as now constituted. If education must be geared to the thought process of the mythical atheist in every class-room, then no mention can be made of God or of God's commandments, and if you take away the ten commandments, what kind of moral restraint remains?

It is a fact, of course, that in practice many public school boards and individual teachers ignore these implications of the law and in one way or another attempt to get over to the children under their care some sort of a moral groundwork for their future life. They rightly feel that if they can't do this kind of teaching they might as well give up teaching altogether.

But the ugly fact remains that the laws opposed to such a course of action are on the books, and if the law is strictly enforced, these teachers would either have to conform to them or quit

their profession or else be jailed. It has literally become a crime against the civil government to talk in a public school about God.

It is not difficult to trace the rise of this weird state of affairs in a so-called Christian nation. For a generation and more public education has been impregnated with the philosophy of secularism. John Dewey is the great prophet and high-priest of the new educational dispensation, and is regarded by his followers with a species of awe and reverence usually accorded only to the Deity.

But for many of these Deweyites, there is no deity; or if there is, He is colorless and remote, and has nothing to do with education as such. The only yardstick used to gauge the success of and educational system is its usefulness for the material purposes of life—getting a job, making money, becoming a social and political success. The moral law does not enter into such considerations because, while it may be useful to observe the conventions in order to get ahead in the world, these moral "conventions" have no objective value in themselves. As a matter of fact, they may even be a hindrance to "self-expression"; they may lead to "inhibitions." And of course the first and greatest commandment is "Thou shalt not be inhibited."

Many well-meaning Protestants have jumped on the bandwagon in the parade towards a completely secularized education. But they are not the ones who have brought the process about. They imagine that they are striking a blow against the dreaded Catholic advance, not realizing in their confusion that if the process they advocate is allowed to reach its logical conclusion, they themselves will suffer even more than the Catholics. Many of these Protestant religions are already highly secu-

larized in outlook, and if moral training of children is completely separated from education, as they advocate, the next generation will be so completely drained of spiritual juices that these religions will die like the chopped-off branches of a tree.

Make no mistake, the real movers of this secularistic program have as their concern the rooting out of all religion from the popular mind. They are to be found high up in the educational councils of our nation; they find their natural habitat in the so-called neutral universities and colleges. To them religion of any kind is an outworn fetish standing in the way of progress. Their plan of attack is simple: *first*, get the public schools completely secularized, *secondly*, force all children to attend the public schools (a professor at Columbia has already advocated exactly that); *thirdly*, then, with a little help by suitable propaganda of the Sunday Supplement variety, all idea of a supernatural religion can be expected to die a natural death.

This plan has been advanced further than most people are willing to admit. What is to be said of its success in producing good citizens? We have poured more money into our public educational system than all the other countries of the world put together. We have a hundred times more books and scientific equipment.

If the utilitarian philosophy of education were productive of good results, surely by this time we should be able to see them. If pouring knowledge into the mind of a child without any reference to moral training is sufficient to make a good citizen, surely by this time we should lead the world in the quality of our citizenry.

Unfortunately, just the opposite seems to be true. The more money we pour out on education, the higher

mounts the rate of juvenile delinquency. We lead the world by any measuring stick you want to use in that unsavoury particular. We have a veritable army of teen-age criminals who were thoroughly subjected to modern progressive education, and who promptly applied their learning to the advanced techniques of safe-cracking.

One would suppose that merely on the basis of experience more people would begin to grasp the truth of George Washington's considered opinion, that good government can flourish only with the support of a deeply imbedded moral sense on the part of the people, and that morality in turn de-

pends upon religion. Leave out these realities from the education of a child, and you are striking a blow at the foundations of the nation itself.

The Catholic church is so convinced of the truth of that statement that she will preserve and defend her school system to the death. And the millions of non-Catholic but God-fearing parents in our country would do well to ponder ways and means of bringing some kind of moral training into the education of their children, since surely they agree with Mr. De Gasperi that "moral conscience is an absolute necessity for the democratic state."

### *Blood is Cheap*

Modern dictators have no priority on murder. The old ones were just as bad. It seems to run in the family. Take Herod, the man we heard about in the Bible Christmas story. Here's a tabulation of his killings according to Giuseppe Zizzamia, the celebrated author of the *Life of Christ*.

37 B.C.: He killed 45 adherents of his opponent in the contest for the city of Jerusalem.

35 B.C.: He killed his brother-in-law Aristobulus who was a high priest in the temple.

34 B.C.: He killed his uncle Joseph.

29 B.C.: He killed his wife Mariamne.

29 B.C.: He killed his mother-in-law Alexandra.

25 B.C.: He killed his brother-in-law Kostobar.

A few years later he killed his two young sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, as well as 300 officials who sided with them.

4 B.C.: Five days before his death, he killed his first-born son, Antipater.

4 B.C.: He killed the holy innocents because he feared the infant Christ would usurp his throne. Some say that there were about 10,000 children amongst the innocents.

Finally, when he had but a short time to live, he foresaw that his death would be an occasion of jubilation on the part of the people. Yet, he wanted some weeping to be done at his death. To that end he brought to the city many prominent Jews and told his servants to slaughter them immediately after his death. In that way the tears were guaranteed for his funeral, at least from the families of the murdered men. Some modern scholars doubt this last tale. So be it. Even if it is not true, Herod still has enough credits on the blood side to put him in the family of the Hitlers and the Stalins. He'll do as a dictator.



## Thoughts for the Shut-in

L. F. Hyland

### For Moments of Weakness

Every shut-in has his good days and his bad, his hours of calmness and composure and his periods of great mental depression and unutterable weakness and pain. For these latter difficult hours, he should cultivate a great devotion to Christ in His agony in Gethsemani.

Like the shut-in, Christ too had His moments of strength and serenity during His passion. One was when he addressed the soldiers who came to make Him their prisoner, and by a simple question caused them to fall to the ground. Another was when He calmly stated the fact of His divinity before the raging Annas and Caiphas and the Sanhedrin. Another was when He discussed truth, and His own mission and kingdom, with Pontius Pilate who was about to condemn Him. A final great moment of triumph was when, just before He died, He cried out in accents of victory: "It is finished—my task is done."

But, like the shut-in, He also had periods of trembling human weakness, of disheartened loneliness such as would come to no other human being. The most terrible of these was His agony in the garden of Gethsemani. There, all the feelings of depression and sorrow that can afflict a human being came together to beat Him flat to the ground. The sense of discouragement and futility, the sense of disproportion between the price He was about to pay for men's souls and the cheap and half-hearted love many would show Him in return; the sense of horror at what lay ahead of Him; the sense of abandonment even by His dearest apostles, who were sleeping while He suffered and would disappear while He was dying; above all, the sense of nauseating companionship with the sins for which He was about to atone.

Each of these agonizing feelings may be experienced in some measure at times, by the shut-in. Even the last, strictly speaking so proper to the Redeemer alone, can be known by the shut-in, if he realizes that all human suffering ordained by God for a Christian, is a means of filling up the measure of atonement needed by sinners. How great, then, should be his devotion to Christ in Gethsemani, seen prostrate on the ground. His fingers clenched in anguish, His features agonizingly constricted, and His blood standing out in red drops of bitter perspiration on His brow. It is not only the fact that someone else has suffered as he is suffering that makes this comforting to the shut-in; it is the fact that Someone Else has made such suffering so valuable.

## Christ and the "Royal Official"

The dramatic qualities in one of the great incidents of Our Lord's life are here brought out, and the lessons are innumerable.

*R. J. Miller*

MOST OF Our Lord's miracles were for the benefit of the poor, but He worked some of them also to show His kindness to the wealthy.

His first miracle was changing water into wine at the wedding feast of Cana in Galilee. After that He went to Jerusalem, where He worked a number of miracles not specifically described in the Gospel. Then, after a few months, He returned to Galilee; and almost immediately on His return worked His second miracle in that country, this time in favor of a very wealthy man.

The story of this second miracle is familiar to Catholics from being read as one of the Sunday Gospels:

There was a certain royal official whose son was lying sick at Capernaum. When he heard that Jesus had come from Judea into Galilee, he went to Him and begged Him to come down and heal his son, for he was at the point of death. But Jesus said to him: "Unless you see signs and wonders, you do not believe." The royal official said to him: "Sir, come down before my child dies." Jesus said to him: "Go back home; your son is going to live." The man believed what Jesus told him, and started back home. And while he was still on the way down, his servants met him to say that his son was well. He asked them therefore at what hour he had got better. And they told him: "Yesterday, at the seventh hour the fever left him." The father realized that it was the very hour when Jesus had told him: "Your son is going to live." And he himself believed, and his whole household.

To be sure, it was a great kindness to the poor father, desperate with grief for his little boy's life; but Our Lord was strikingly unceremonious in the way He actually showed the kindness. The entire incident, in fact, is full of dramatic contrasts and unexpected turns: the man's wealth over against his helplessness in the face of death; his social prominence and Our Lord's humble human background; his political power and his suppliant attitude towards the carpenter's Son; and Christ masterfully dominating the entire story: famous even among the great as the supreme wonderworker; mysterious in His abrupt reproof of the heartbroken father; effortless, almost offhand, in the actual working of the miracle.

A lover of Christ eager to fill in the framework of the matter-of-fact Gospel account with the details it skips or takes for granted could develop, with the help of clues suggested by other lovers of Christ through the ages, a plausible reconstruction of the dramatic story as follows.

The royal official was a "very important person". The different English versions of the Gospel call him "royal official", "ruler", or "nobleman". In Galilee, the land of King Herod, such a personage must have been close to Herod himself. In fact, following the suggestions of some students of the Holy Gospel, we shall say he was none other than the "Chuza, Herod's steward", mentioned in St. Luke's eighth chapter; a kind of secretary of the treasury and director of public works in the royal

cabinet of Herod. A "very important person" indeed, in the Galilee of Our Lord's time.

He and his wife Joanna and their little boy had gone to Jerusalem for the Paschal feast a few months before; and while there had heard marvelous tales about a young prophet named John the Baptist. People were saying, even some from the upper classes, that he might possibly be the Messiah. This John was calling vigorously, it seemed, for a renewal of morals, for penance, in preparation for the coming of "the kingdom of God." But he was working no miracles, and Chuza was not impressed with his call for penance and his talk of the kingdom of God.

It was different, however, with another young Prophet who happened to be in Jerusalem at that same time. Jesus of Nazareth, this one was called, of Nazareth in Chuza's own country, Galilee, and He was setting the town talking with the miracles He was working in Jerusalem.

Master, we know that you have come from God to teach us; for no one could work miracles like you do if God were not with him.

That is what one of the leaders of the Jews, called Nicodemus, was saying to the prophet from Nazareth at that very time, late one night in an upper room in Jerusalem by the light of a flickering lamp.

Chuza was impressed by these rumors of signs and wonders. He shared his master Herod's love of theatricals (Herod always carried a troupe of actors and magicians with him, even on his travels) and like him was anxious to see some "sign or wonder" worked by the young Prophet of Nazareth in his own presence.

His curiosity was not gratified in

Jerusalem, however, and finally he returned home to his palace in Capharnaum, the greatest mansion in town. But it was not long until the magnificent dwelling was turned into a house of mourning.

And here begins a series of dramatic scenes that make one think in terms of the vivid sequences of a well-developed moving picture story: grave-faced, bearded doctors being guided through the palace portals and up magnificent staircases by the distracted father, into the sick boy's bedchamber with its rich Oriental appointments and its silent sorrowful servants; the doctors bending over the little patient as he lay tossing in delirium, then looking at each other, holding consultations, gravely shaking their heads; and finally breaking the fatal news to the incredulous, desperate Chuza. His expostulations, his despair; then a servant coming humbly from behind to whisper in his ear; Chuza's surprise and joy; "Jesus of Nazareth is back in Galilee! The wonderworker! Where is He? Where, did you say? Bring round my chariot at once! Hurry!"

Then the headlong ride in his ornate chariot, Chuza seated behind his driver, urging him to lash the horses as they hurtle through the streets of Capharnaum; then out into the open country, steadily climbing as they reach the hills; dashing wildly through the market places of small towns, careening past caravans of camels on the highway; stopping again and again back in the hills, Chuza leaping out to ask information and directions: "Was Jesus of Nazareth here? When? Where was He going? Which way?" And off again, sometimes on a false trail, then close behind: "The next town? Cana, you say? Drive on!" Finally, shortly after noonday, the meeting.

Picture the striking contrasts in that

## The Liguorian

meeting. Chuza in his rich garments, with his chariot, his driver, his thoroughbred steeds; Chuza one of the most powerful men in Galilee (and Our Lord's disciples in the background probably gaping open-mouthed and nudging each other incredulously: "It's Chuza!" "Who?" "Herod's steward, *Chuza!*"), now an incoherent beggar, babbling his woe and desperation and with urgent gesticulations beseeching Our Lord to get in the chariot and drive "down" with him to Capharnaum to cure his dying son. (It would have been a wild ride, for a certainty; sixteen miles all down hill with a desperate father urging "faster, faster!" all the way!)

If Chuza had not been impressed by John the Baptist's preaching of the Kingdom of God, Our Lord seems strangely unimpressed here by the rank and dignity of his royal client. That is the first dramatic contrast in their meeting. Chuza was a "royal official"; Our Lord, humanly speaking, was a nobody from the hills. Yet Chuza is the suppliant beggar, and Our Lord the self-possessed master of the situation. On the other hand, Chuza was a father desperately concerned for the life of his little boy; Our Lord was the divine pity incarnate, yet at first He seems to rebuff the poor father.

Unless you see signs and wonders, you do not believe.

Note the very interesting point here that these words of Our Lord to Chuza were not in the singular, but in the plural. It is as though He were addressing him as the member of a group of sophisticated unbelievers; as though, indeed, He had in mind Chuza's master Herod before whom He was to stand as a criminal one day Himself, while the old "fox" would "question Him with many words" in hopes of "seeing some

miracle done by Him."

Unless you see signs and wonders, you do not believe.

In that setting (and in our moving picture drama the point would be brought out vividly with an inserted scene of the Passion, and Our Lord before Herod) the words are not harsh, but the knell of an approaching doom; and they reveal Jesus Christ all the more strikingly as the incomparable "Human Being", master of every situation.

And now Chuza is definitely impressed. The very fact that the young Prophet showed no sign of being overawed in his presence, and even treated him, Chuza, the royal official, as a kind of inferior, gave him new respect for His power. And he knew in his heart that the rebuke was deserved. Up to now, before his boy was taken ill, faith in God and in the Kingdom of God had not meant much to him. But now, God knows, he thought, I am not looking for magic tricks to divert me now, whatever I wanted in the past. I want a miracle from God to cure my boy, and I believe this man can give it to me.

Sir, come down before my child dies!

"Sir": the very title betokened new respect. Herod's steward was talking to the carpenter's Son as to a superior! And then there was the note of desperation, the sense of a final wild pleading: "*Come down, before my child dies!*"

Our Lord saw the new humility, and His Heart was touched by the father's heartbreak. He was moved to kindness for this poor man of wealth, and he granted his request.

Yet He granted it in His own way. Ever free, ever master of His decisions,

## The Liguorian

of infinite variety even in the technique of His wonder-working, He worked this miracle with an off-hand ease that stands quite by itself. While in the case of other needy persons He would condescend to perform certain external rites, as when He applied a paste of mud and spittle to the poor blind man's eyes, here He willed no external sign at all. Where, in the case of the centurion asking for the cure of his servant, He Himself offered to go to the centurion's house, here He refused the nobleman's urgent invitation to come to his palace.

Go back home; your son is going to live.

This is the supreme contrast of the entire story. The nobleman's urgency and the undisturbed self-control of the carpenter's Son; the invitation to come as an honored guest and benefactor to the greatest house in Capharnaum, and the off-hand refusal of the invitation; the father's desperate need, and the perfect ease with which the need is filled; a human being in suppliant petition, and divine assurance granting his prayer; indeed, a child's distress and woe, and a fatherly calm reassurance that there was nothing to fear, and all was going to be well.

Go back home: your son is going to live.

Chuza was more than impressed now; he was convinced. The very absence of ceremony was an argument that struck his heart. Experienced as he was with the ways of professional magicians in Herod's theatrical productions, any show of elaborate ritual on Our Lord's part would have been for him an obstacle rather than a help to faith. Our Lord knew this, and adapted His way of working the miracle to the disposition of Chuza's soul. And Herod's stew-

ard responded generously to the inspiration of the grace of Christ.

The man believed what Jesus told him.

Not that he as yet believed completely that Jesus was the Messiah; that was to come on the morrow, when "what Jesus told him" would be verified by the message of the servants to meet him on the way home. But he did believe that his little boy was going to live; and in the certainty of that belief, a great relief flooded his heart. The anxiety, the burden, the awful tension that had gripped his heart for days and nights disappeared completely, and gave place to a peace in which he could rest like a tired child.

He looked about him. It was just one o'clock. His jaded horses stood steaming in the noonday sunshine, and he realized suddenly almost with a sense of joyful abandon that he was hot and dusty and very tired himself.

Gratefully, but now with dignity as became Herod's steward, he bade farewell to Our Lord, then briefly ordered his driver to proceed to the castle of a wealthy friend nearby. There they would rest and spend the night. No need to rush home now, especially since the boy was safe; they would first of all get their needed rest.

Early next morning he set off for home. Before he had gone far, however, he spied a group of familiar figures approaching along the highway; they began to wave and shout when they recognized his chariot, and he saw they were some of his own servants from Capharnaum. With joyous shouts they crowded around: "Your son is better; he did not die; he is alive and well!"

Chuza was not surprised; it was only what he expected. But he had an eager question to ask on his part: "When?

When did he get better?" "Yesterday!" "Yesterday, but what time yesterday?" "At one o'clock!" "At one o'clock his fever left him all of a sudden!" "And it did not come back!" "He is as well as ever!"

The father realized that it was the very hour when Jesus had told him: "Your son is going to live."

Chuzza had been certain that his boy would recover; but now of a sudden a new certainty entered his heart. The young Prophet had not only predicted the cure; He had actually caused it, in a moment of time, at a distance!

And he himself believed, and his whole household.

He hurried home, to find the boy sleeping the peaceful sleep of healthy childhood. His wife Joanna, tearful in her relief and joy, at first was inclined to offer wifely pity for his useless trip, since the boy had recovered without the Prophet's coming to the house. But when Chuzza had explained what had

happened, and she saw the conviction in his eyes when he spoke of Jesus of Nazareth, and heard the extraordinary coincidence of Jesus' words: "Your son is going to live!" at the very moment the fever left the child, she too felt the grace of belief flood her heart.

And when Jesus came down to Capharnaum later that month, they both sought Him out for a long conference. The upshot was that the two of them with their little boy and their whole great army of servants became His faithful disciples. Indeed, Joanna went even further: when Jesus began His missionary journeys through Galilee and the surrounding country, she joined the wealthy women who followed Him and the Twelve to care for their material wants, as St. Luke says:

With Him were the twelve, and certain women who had been cured of evil spirits and infirmities: Mary, who is called the Magdalene, from whom seven devils had gone out, and Joanna the wife of Chuzza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, who used to provide for them out of their means.

### *Evidence*

A recent issue of *Newsweek* relates an interesting anecdote which is supposed to be making the rounds (secretly, of course) of one of the Iron Curtain countries in Europe.

It seems that a Communist police official had in his office a skeleton which, it was claimed, was the skeleton of Attila, mediaeval leader of the Huns, and known as the "Scourge of God" from his ferocity in battle.

The official became suspicious of the genuineness of the bones, and ordered one of his menials to verify the truth of the claim.

The lesser potentate carried the skeleton off with him, and a few days later returned with the triumphant word that he had proved beyond doubt that the bones were those of Attila himself.

"How did you find out?" the chief inquired.

The lieutenant grinned, and pointing to the skeleton which he had brought back with him, and which seemed to be in a very battered condition, he said:

"He confessed!"



## Side Glances

By the Bystander

The Ingrid Bergman-Roberto Rossellini affair has created a furore of comment from all quarters, Catholic and non-Catholic. The secular press has been filled, all of a sudden, with shocked denunciations and expressions of sanctimonious horror. The citizens of many communities are pushing the banning of all Bergman's pictures on the score of the bad example she has given. And Catholics! Read some of the Readers' Retorts in this issue of *The Liguorian* to see how some of them are reacting to the suggestion, made so far by nobody but the two paramours, that they would seek annulments of their previous marriages in order to obtain authorization and blessing for their admittedly sinful alliance. The storm in the secular press has induced Walter Winchell, who seems to have reached the stage of considering himself a kind of spiritual Daddy to the whole world, to use his radio program to rebuke his millions of listeners for failing in showing mercy to sinners.

In regard to the reaction of the daily newspapers, it would certainly be the height of unintelligence for anyone to permit his attitude to be formed on the basis of what they have to say. Especially is this true for Catholics, and it should also be true for millions of non-Catholics. For years the newspapers, following the hysterical leads given them by the movie magazines and the Hollywood columnists, have been approving adulteries that were covered over only by the diaphanous veil of overnight, mail-order, trumped up and cheap divorces. The fourth and fifth marriages of movie stars have been played up with as many pictures, as much gushing sentimentality, and as hearty an approval, as their first. And did anyone notice that the papers had any qualms about printing all the scandalous

facts of the Bergman-Rossellini affair on their front pages? Perhaps the heights of journalistic inconsistency were reached by the woman columnist who recently wrote scathingly of Bergman's misdeeds. She followed this up by saying that she saw no reason, however, for boycotting Bergman's pictures, but that she had taken a personal vow never again to go to a Rita Hayworth picture (Aly Khan's present consort) because Rita had been guilty of such unspeakably bad taste in her carryings on. The greatest immorality in her book is *bad taste*, not the breaking of a law of God.

Despite such drivels, it is possible to look on the whole matter in another light. On the other side of the score sheet it should be noted that there is something good in the horrified reaction of the general public, including many writers in newspapers, to this movie world scandal. It gives evidence that Americans, no matter how far they have traveled in that direction, have not quite severed their consciences completely from respect for the natural law of God. This secularized and de-spiritualized generation is a lot closer to "thinking with the Catholic Church" than it would ever admit in so many words. This is, therefore, just another bit of proof that the human soul is instinctively Christian, and, because Christianity has only one objectively true form, instinctively Catholic. The conclusion drawn by most of the shocked commentators on the affair has been that "something ought to be done about this—there ought to be some way of making such notorious sinners know what grave scandal they have given." Well, the Catholic Church has severe penalties for her own children who commit such grave crimes against marriage; they have been on her books for centuries

and still apply with full force. According to the law of the Catholic Church, if two people commit adultery and promise to marry each other, they thereby incur an impediment that would invalidate their marriage to each other, even if, before they got around to attempting the marriage, the injured partner of one or the other were to die. In other words, the Catholic Church goes just as far as she can in protecting lawful marriage; she tells adulterers who promise to marry each other that they thereby bar themselves from marrying each other validly.

•

But what grieves one most about the whole case is the reaction among some Catholics. It seems to be based on an ungrounded fear that the Catholic Church is about to compromise herself by unjustifiably smoothing the way to a marriage in the Church for Ingrid and Roberto. The origin of this fear clearly lies in the fact that these Catholics have been listening too submissively to the sneers and jibes of ignorant non-Catholics and prejudiced anti-Catholics. These people, and the Catholics who listen to them too respectfully, point to a number of circumstances that, in the words of the comic opera, have nothing to do with the case. First of all, the accidental circumstance that Rossellini happens to have a home in Rome and to be living there with Bergman. The implication is that they are practically in the Vatican already, weeping on the shoulder of the Pope, whereas in reality they might be living in Australia, so far as that has anything to do with their case for annulments. Secondly, scandal has been expressed because a priest was to baptize their baby, and because nuns were taking care of it. Don't they know that nuns have been taking care of the illegitimate babies of sinners for centuries, and that a priest must baptize any baby that is brought to him if complete and trustworthy assurance can be given him that it will be reared as a Catholic?

•

But the major scandal seems to have been taken from the mere fact that Rossellini and Bergman have been talking about seeking annulments. The uninformed person immediately says: "Oh, oh. They are in Rome. They have money. They are prominent people. They have both been married previously. Watch them get whatever they want from the Church." This is silly. It is, of course, what the prejudiced and ignorant non-Catholic says; that it should be repeated by a Catholic is a shame. It is a shame because there are so many factors that a Catholic, of all people, should be capable of considering. Naturally, the whole question of annulments is like Greek to the non-Catholic who has taken all he knows about the Catholic Church from outsiders who hate it and have never studied or read anything first-hand about it. How many such are acquainted with even a fraction of the simple facts and principles stated in the article in this issue of *The Liguorian* entitled "These Marriage Annulments"? Every case, prominent or obscure, of a marriage annulment in the history of the Church has been settled on the basis of the facts and principles outlined (very generally) there. Every future case will be settled on the basis of those principles and the facts about the case that can be proved. But non-Catholics talk about annulments as if they were arbitrary privileges handed out for a consideration, and they have repeated this ignorant assumption so often that some Catholics have been taken in by it. The truth can be found out, by anybody who really wants to know it and is willing to examine the records.

•

Now, with regard to any appeal that Rossellini and Bergman might make at some future time for an annulment. First of all, they are a strange couple to be looking for anything from the Catholic Church. Rossellini is far from, and probably knows he is far from, any kind of agreement with Catholic truth. That is clear

from the fact that in one interview he asserted that his affair with Bergman was a great "spiritual awakening" for him, and that he would celebrate this spiritual awakening by producing a picture of St. Francis of Assisi, which he is said to be working on now. That is the kind of talk you might expect to read of in the *True Love Story* magazine, or in the *Ladies' Home Journal*, but it is neither Christian nor Catholic. Calling an adulterous affair a spiritual awakening is just pagan patter, and bringing St. Francis into it is brash blasphemy. Bergman has always been a Protestant, and it is doubtful whether, despite the so-called Catholic pictures she has appeared in, she has any clear notions of what the Catholic faith is all about. There is probably an incalculable amount of ignorance about the Catholic faith in both. However, it is not unthinkable that both should repent of their sins; it is not unthinkable that they are trying to repent right now. It is not an outlandish thought that Rossellini should (possibly through the intercession of St. Francis, who would be returning good for evil) want to be restored to his childhood faith, and to renounce such immoral propositions as that infidelity can constitute a spiritual awakening. It is not preposterous that Bergman might, like millions of others, do a little thinking and praying and, as a result, want to become a Catholic. In that case, they would both have to be told, by the first priest, bishop, Cardinal or Pope to whom they spoke of

their aspirations, that no one can receive the sacraments in the Catholic Church while living in an invalid marriage; that both their former marriages are presumed to be valid unless provable facts contemporary with their entrance into their first marriages clearly show them to have been invalid or dissoluble; that extraordinary penance must be done for any extraordinary scandal that they have given. Not much more could be asked, in the way of adhering to principles, and at the same time extending the mercy of Christ to sinners. It should be the prayer of Catholics that these two sinners will have the grace to repent of their sins; that they may come to seek full membership in the Mystical Body of Christ; that they will have the grace to separate from each other if that is the condition of such membership; that, if their first marriages should prove to have been invalid by reason of defect of consent, or ceremony, or freedom from impediment, the facts may be brought to light, no matter what Pharisees may think of the outcome. It would be far better if these things were to happen, than that this "case" may run the course of many such others: that Roberto's "spiritual awakening" may, after a few months or a few years, curdle into apathy and weariness; and that Hollywood and the fleshpots of America may call to Ingrid with an insistent voice, and that she may come back to Hollywood—alone, and ripe for another "affair".

### Ready to Tell All

A mother had just been telling her small son some of the "facts of life," and when she finished, she said: "Now, son, are there any questions you would like to ask? Anything at all, don't be afraid."

After a little heavy thinking, the little boy replied: "Well, there is something I've been wanting to know for a long time."

The mother's heart failed her, but she was game.

"What is it, son?" she asked.

"Mother," he said seriously, "just *how* do they make bricks?"

—*Parents' Magazine*



## Catholic Anecdotes

### *Brotherly Love*

From the Jesuit mission magazine, *Our Vineyard*, comes the following touching incident.

Amid the current persecution of the church in Hungary, many priests are being arrested and jailed. Recently the Jesuit Father Joseph Vid was arrested in Budapest, together with the lay-brother John Varady.

Both were brought into court, and the judges were surprised to hear the priest make the following appeal:

"If according to your laws we must be punished, I ask that the more severe punishment be inflicted upon me. I am old and Varady is young; I am sickly, while he is in the best of health."

When the judges seemed unmoved, the priest continued his plea:

"With the grace of the priesthood, I will be able to bear the punishment more easily. Moreover, I have no relatives, while this young man's seventy-year-old mother is filled with anxiety over his fate. It is true, I have three brothers, but they are communists, and will shed no tears over me whatever sentence is passed."

Whether the judges were finally impressed by this extraordinary example of fortitude and charity is not reported. In any case, both the priest and the lay-brother were condemned to three years' imprisonment.

### *Deflating the Ego*

A lesson in courteous charity that many Christians might profit by.

Many years ago there lived a Greek doctor named Menekrates. It was long before the time of Christ, during the era when Greece ruled the world, and when

many false gods were worshipped and adored.

Now Menekrates had some skill in his profession, and was fortunate enough to cure many of his patients. Unfortunately, his increasing success only served to inflate his already swollen vanity, and he ended by deluding himself into the belief that he was a little god in his own right. To his own name, he added the high-sounding name of Jupiter.

One day he was invited to dinner by King Philip of Macedonia, who knew well the reputation of his guest.

When the pompous doctor arrived at the palace, the king had a brazier of burning coals placed before him, having first supplied him with an ornate chair or throne. Then all the other guests approached and placed incense on the coals, saying as they did so:

"All honor to the god, Menekrates Jupiter."

Naturally, this caused the doctor almost to burst out of his skin with pride, but soon he began to feel that something was wrong. All the other guests were seated around the banquet table at the other end of the hall, stuffing themselves with rich food. When he attempted to join them, two attendants gently pushed him back upon his throne, and placed more incense upon the burning coals, saying: "All honor to the god, Menekrates Jupiter."

The doctor soon discovered that the smell of burning incense afforded little solace for a hungry stomach, and almost at the same moment he realized that he was the victim of a joke.

Greatly discomfited, he crept out of the hall, with the guffaws of the king and his guests ringing in his ears.



## Pointed Paragraphs

### *Not for Faith Alone*

Holy Week commemorates, with dramatic realism, the passion and death of Christ. And the passion and death of Christ give the best answer we know to the principle proposed by some religious sects that all anyone has to do to be saved is to believe firmly in Christ.

The passion and death of Christ were obviously endured by Him in order that they might constitute an appeal to the whole make-up of man. It is true that they effectively and primarily paid the debt that man owed to God for sin. But that debt in itself could have been paid by a divine appeaser without the suffering and humiliation to which Christ actually submitted. And if the only thing any man would ever need to attain his salvation would be a belief in Christ as His Redeemer, it should be clear that Christ could have become and announced Himself to all as a Redeemer without passing through the horrors He experienced.

The fact is that faith in Christ as the Redeemer is not alone sufficient for salvation, and that Christ knew that any cheaper price He might have paid for man's redemption would not have been sufficient to induce men to pay their price to share in that redemption. This price is love added to faith, atonement added to consciousness of sin, obedience added to prayer. He permitted sin to do its worst to Him in order to impress human beings with the awfulness of sin; in order to let the story of His love and His willingness to suffer everything sin deserved to play on the imaginations, memories, sensibilities, emotions, as well as on the

minds and wills of men and so motivate them to good conduct as well as strong faith.

To say that only faith in Christ is necessary for salvation is therefore, in a sense, to make pointless the tremendous appeal of Christ's passion to the love and loyalty of mankind. And by meditating on His passion and death men have found it possible to be obedient and loyal unto Him even to death.

Faith is basic and necessary, but it must be accompanied by love and action. It is from the passion of Christ that men find the motivation necessary for these.

### *Back Where We Started From*

Human beings are forever going around in circles, in the sense of completing cycles back to points of the natural law from which, at one time, they thought it best to move furiously away.

The latest example of a completed cycle is the manner in which high-ranking and medical and psychological experts are beating the drums for the physical, therapeutic and emotional value of child-bearing among women.

At one time, a few generations ago, child-bearing was considered a good thing for wives, not because medical experts had acclaimed it, but because it was considered a part of the natural law that wifehood should lead to motherhood. The natural law came from God, this viewpoint recognized; God was infinitely wise; therefore the wisest thing for a human being to do was what God prescribed, even thought it might mean having half a dozen to a dozen children.

Then came the revolution. It was decided that having children early and often was too much for women to bear. It was a terrific drain on their physical resources. It spoiled their looks. It cost them their freedom. It upset them emotionally. It ruined them financially, especially if their husbands were underpaid by huge corporations. (It was easier to stop having children than to campaign for living wages, and many employers preferred it.) So the natural law had to be scrapped. Man knew better. Women knew better. Margaret Sanger knew better. They were all wiser than God.

So they kept moving around the circle, farther and farther away from the natural law. A wife didn't have to have any children, if she didn't want to. Or she might have one, and be done with it. Or two, well-spaced. And the sorriest collection of devices, gadgets, tricks and contraptions the world has ever seen was invented to make wives safe from having babies.

But traveling a circle always leads one back to the point from which one started. Just when the reformers reached the point where they had four out of five wives glorying in childlessness, or in one-child or two-children families, the world began to notice that there was something wrong with most of them. They developed tumors. Or cancers. Or neurosis. They broke down. They cracked up. They went to pieces. They fell apart. Especially, they contracted a new disease called endometriosis, which the laity referred to as "female trouble." They were a sorry lot, these wives that resisted motherhood.

And now, the scientists and experts are coming up with a brand new discovery. However, it is only the old natural law of God dressed in an academic gown. At the famous Johns Hop-

kins University it has been stated that science has learned that frequent pregnancy is not only not harmful to the normal wife, but a boon to her health. At Tulane University in New Orleans last fall, a couple of noted physicians stated that "there is now general agreement that one of the causes of endometriosis, (one of the most crippling of female diseases, is the use of contraceptives, delaying the normal function of child-bearing." The same doctors proclaimed that, "other than pregnancy, there is little that the medical profession can offer these women in a conservative, non-surgical way" as a cure for their troubles.

It is only sad that the ignoble experiment of substituting the short-sighted wisdom of man for the eternal wisdom of God's law has had to cost so many women their health as well as their potential families. Maybe the next generation of wives will have more respect for the natural law, and will scrap the gadgets and contraptions that have been devised to circumvent it.

### *For Catholic Parents*

Some Catholic parents are inclined to put the Church on the defensive when it comes to the question of state or non-sectarian university education.

These parents want the Church to *prove* that she is right in saying that such education is dangerous to the faith of the young people who are exposed to it. They will not accept a decision handed down in all seriousness and after deep consideration and thorough investigation by Peter, Christ's vicar on earth, merely because Peter is Peter. Peter must give scientific reasons for his proclamations, and especially for this proclamation about secular university education.

Lately Peter has found scientific reasons that should be cogent enough to

satisfy all parents who have sons and daughters of university age.

At Harvard there is a very prominent professor of anthropology by the name of Dr. Ernest A. Hooton. Dr. Hooton said recently not only to his callow undergraduates at Harvard but also to the whole world that "mercy killing of a pain-tortured woman cancer patient merits universal commendation." Then he enunciated this awful blasphemy: "If 'Thou shalt not kill' is a law of God that convicts Dr. Sander of murder, let us have done with such a savage and sub-human deity and substitute a God of mercy and loving kindness."

In other words Dr. Hooton doesn't give a hoot for God or God's law or human life or anything else that conflicts with his idea of mercy and love. Dr. Hooton would fashion a new God with his own little anthropological hands. What a man he must be! We shall wait and see if his new God has Himself killed on a cross and on the third day after His burial rises from the grave.

Would Catholic parents care to have their impressionable children sit under Dr. Hooton, who is known as one of the world's leading anthropologists, and imbibe his tragic nonsense for four years?

At Yale there is another professor who belongs to the same family of home-made gods as Dr. Hooton. His name is Dr. George Peter Murdock. He also is an anthropologist.

Dr. Murdock teaches this: "There is nothing in man's social experience to indicate that the ideal of premarital chastity has any scientific value . . . I see no grounds for regarding sexual laxity among our youth as socially dangerous."

Dr. Murdock, famous and honored professor of the great Yale university,

encourages young people to let their glands be their guides. He teaches that it is perfectly alright for boys and girls to fornicate, use their own and each other's bodies to their heart's content, to give free vent to passion whenever the feeling is upon them "provided, of course, all this is done under social control."

Would Catholic mothers and fathers care to have their sons, and *especially their daughters* attend the classes that are conducted by Dr. Murdock?

It is no objection for parents to say that these professors are only *two* men, that there must be good and sensible professors by the score on the same faculties. The very fact of Harvard and Yale supporting such professors is a sign that almost anybody can teach at Harvard and Yale provided they are learned in anthropology or in any of the other sciences that make up the curriculum. It is the secularistic atmosphere of these places that is dangerous. And any Catholic mother and father who send their children to such universities might just as well send them into a lion's den as far as their faith is concerned. They might come out alive; but the chances are that they shall come out dead—just as dead as are Professors Ernest A. Hooton and George Peter Murdock.

### *Assault Charge Dismissed*

We just ran across a clipping of a decision handed down by a judge in Hyattsville, Maryland, last year, that ought to be enshrined somewhere in stone.

A mother had brought an assault charge against her 9 year old son's school teacher because the latter had given the boy a good shaking. The teacher admitted the shaking, and said that it was administered because the boy thumbed his nose at her.

The judge dismissed the charge with this statement:

"When I went to school, we weren't just shaken. Teachers used to thrash us. And when we told our parents about it, our parents thrashed us again. It seems to me the law permits some disciplining. If we don't have teachers to discipline our children, and parents don't discipline them at home, what are we raising? Wild oats?"

The judge's rhetorical question did not need to be answered. While, in the old days, corporal punishment may have, at times, been carried to extremes, there is little doubt that today it is extremely neglected. Children know they can get by with the most outrageous disrespect and that nobody will lay a hand on them. That is why they become braggarts and bullies.

Maybe if some of the thugs who are guilty of real assault and battery against their fellow-men had been subjected to "assault" in the mild form of discipline when they were children, they would never have become a headache to society.

### *Source of Light*

One of the problems that sometimes perplex Catholics is that of providing a follow-up source of information to non-Catholics who ask them questions about their religion. To answer a single question of a non-Catholic is sometimes easy. But the asking of the question often exposes a rather wistful desire in the heart of the non-Catholic to learn more. The problem is how to place him within easy reach of that further knowledge he would like to have.

In many instances the desire for Catholic knowledge is not strong enough to overcome the non-Catholic inbred fear of calling on a priest and asking for instructions. No matter how emphatically it may be stated that ask-

ing a priest for instructions in no way commits a non-Catholic to adopt the Catholic religion, there often remains an inexplicable fear of the neutral step of approaching a priest, even in the company of a Catholic.

The Catholic may suggest books to be read, etc., but in this, even though the Catholic be fairly well read himself, it is not easy to know just what books will suit the needs of the non-Catholic.

The best answer to this problem is the suggestion that an interested non-Catholic take one of the correspondence courses in Catholic teaching that are available. No personal contact with a Catholic priest is called for; the non-Catholic may drop the correspondence course at any time he wishes; and the material he receives through the mail is nothing other than simple, positive explanations of what Catholics believe and why they do what they do.

Two such sources of information about the Catholic religion by mail are here recommended. One is the Catholic Information Bureau, 4422 Lindell Blvd., St. Louis, Missouri. All anyone has to do to receive Catholic information from this source is to write asking for it.

The other is a fairly recent organization in this field. It is called "Home Study", and is located at Woodstock College, Woodstock, Maryland. Anyone who writes to this address will receive (free) six installments of instructions, covering all the important teachings of the Catholic religion. Among them are answers to questions such as these: "Why do Catholics confess their sins to a priest? Who said there is a hell? Can a Pope make a mistake? Why do not priests marry? Are all who are not Catholics lost?"

The two addresses should be filed away by all Catholics for use when someone needs such a "source of light".



# Liguoriana



EXCERPTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF ST. ALPHONSUS

Selected and Edited by J. Schaefer

## THE LAST THINGS

### 5. *The Resurrection (Cont.):*

The doctrine of the resurrection of the human body on the last day has attracted the interest of theologians since the foundation of the Church. Of consuming interest to them has been the question of the nature and condition of the body after the resurrection. In condemning a number of heretics, the Church has defined that our bodies shall be numerically the same as before death. This seems clear also from numerous texts in Sacred Scripture, one of which is the famous text of St. Paul: "This corruptible must put on incorruption; and this mortal must put on immortality. And when this mortal hath put on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written: 'Death is swallowed up in victory. O Death, where is thy victory? O Death, where is thy sting?'" For should the soul not be reunited to the same body, this corruptible body could not be said to receive incorruptibility, nor could the body claim victory over death.

In view of this doctrine of the Church a rather delicate question has been posed. It is known that there have been, and perhaps still are, cannibals, men who nourish themselves on human flesh, in different parts of the world. Will both the cannibal and his victim, then, arise with the same flesh? St. Thomas answers that, by some operation of the divine power, the flesh of the man which has been devoured will be returned to him, while the cannibal will receive flesh formed on him by other forms of nourishment.

Similarly, by an operation of the divine power, those whose bodies had

been overdeveloped will probably receive but a becoming amount of their former matter, while those whose bodies had been underdeveloped, whether because of disease or age, will probably receive additional matter. Each shall arise with all his members, for they are essential to the structure of the human body, and hence to a perfect resurrection. Moreover, those who have, from their birth, been deprived of essential members by accident or some sort of malformation, will receive these members in the resurrection.

Such organs of the body as the digestive system, the intestines, and so forth, may seem to be superfluous after the resurrection, for we shall no longer have any use for foods or drinks. Nevertheless, as St. Thomas remarks, they shall probably arise with the human body, since they contribute to the perfection of the body. In a similar manner, such appendages of the body as the hair and nails will also arise with the body, for though they will no longer fulfill their office of preserving other parts of the body, they still contribute to the full perfection of the body. They will arise in sufficient quantity for the proper adornment of man.

As to the question of age, the bodies of the blessed will arise in the full perfection of manhood. This is not so much a matter of years as of the state of the body perfectly formed and without defect. It is commonly believed, however, that the elect will arise with those dimensions and characteristics proper to the perfect age of man. This is usually about the 33rd year, the age at which the body has received its full develop-

ment and begins to decline. Since the resurrection is to be primarily a renovation of human nature, and not specifically a reward or punishment of merits and demerits, the reprobate will also probably arise without such deformities and defects as blindness, dumbness, lameness and so forth. This integrity of their bodies, however, will not be to the advantage of the damned, for the very perfection of their bodies will but add another refinement to the severity of their torment.

Some writers upon the subject of the resurrection have maintained that there will be only one sex, the masculine, after the resurrection. But theologians in general maintain that each member of the human race shall rise in his own proper sex, for the masculine and feminine sexes are complementary to each other, contributing to the perfection of the human species. But since, after the resurrection, man will have attained his final perfection, the number of men will be completed, and there will no longer be any birth or death, the generative and nutritive powers of the body, which are proper to animal activity in the present life, will cease.

Aside from these faculties, however, both the blessed and the damned will enjoy the use of the faculties of sense, as a reward or punishment of the merits or demerits of their bodies during life. The blessed, for instance, will enjoy through their sense of sight the beauty of the bodies of Jesus Christ and His divine Mother, for, after the Saviour, Mary will surpass in beauty the bodies of all the other blessed. Through the sense of hearing they shall enjoy the voices of all the Saints, chanting with a celestial melody the praises of God and those of the other blessed. The senses of smell, touch and taste will, likewise, have their own particular delights. All these pleasures of sense God

has set aside for the blessed after the resurrection, according to the prophecy of St. Paul: "Eye has not seen, nor has ear heard, nor has it entered into the heart of man to conceive, what God has prepared for them that love Him."

In addition to these glories of the human body after the resurrection, the bodies of the blessed will be endowed with four special qualities or properties. The first of these will be that of *impassibility*. By virtue of this quality, the bodies of the blessed will be exempt from any change whatsoever. Even should they be placed in the flames of hell itself, they would be unable to endure any pain from the action of the flames or the demons. For, just as their souls are completely subject to God in heaven, so also are their bodies perfectly subject to their souls. No power can weaken this subjection of body to the soul, and hence no power can produce any change in the glorious body.

The second quality of the bodies of the blessed will be that of *subtility*. This quality of the bodies of the blessed will exempt them, because of their perfect submission to the soul, from all limitations of size and weight. The soul will be enabled to govern the body as though it were a spirit, granting it the capability of penetrating other bodies and occupying the same place with them, and of rendering itself visible or invisible at will. This subtility of the glorious bodies will not, however, render them untouchable, for they will remain solid and offer resistance to other bodies.

The remaining qualities of the bodies of the blessed will be those of *agility* and *clarity*. By virtue of the former quality the soul will be able to transport the body wherever and however it will. This movement will be so rapid as to be imperceptible, the body seeming to be in different places at one and

the same time. By their quality of clarity, the bodies of the blessed will be endowed with a wonderful brilliancy, rendering them brighter than the sun itself, though without offense to the sense of sight, but rather producing a pleasant sensation in it. This clarity of the glorious body will be completely under the will of the blessed: they will be able to reveal or conceal it as they wish.

The bodies of the damned will, also,

be endowed with certain qualities, for their punishment, however, rather than for their glory. They will be *entire*, at least in so far as they were during their mortal life, as was explained above. They, too, will be *incorruptible*, preserved in this state by an operation of the divine power. For just as the bodies of the blessed will be preserved for their eternal beatitude, so the bodies of the damned will be preserved by the divine justice for their eternal torment.

### Business With Pleasure

Perhaps American business men as a class would be happier, and would develop fewer ulcers, if they adopted the philosophy of the Mexican in the market-place in Mexico City. His entire stock in trade consisted of fifteen or twenty strings of onions.

An American tourist approached him, and, more for the fun of it than for any other reason, sought to bargain with him.

"How much are they?" he asked.

"Ten cents a string," was the reply.

"Three strings for a quarter?"

"No. Three strings, thirty cents."

"But three strings should be cheaper. Look here, suppose I buy all your onions. Will you give them to me cheaper?"

The old Mexican looked very disdainful. "Senor," he said, "Not to you or to anyone else will I sell all my onions at one time."

"But why not? Isn't that why you are here?"

"No, senor. I am here to live my life. I love this market place with its crowds. The pretty young women. The ugly old men. Good friends who stop to smoke a cigarette. They tell me how the crops are. Which senorita is getting married. Who has a new baby. Who is sick, and who has died. That is why I sit here all day and sell onions. If you buy them all, my day is done. I have sold away my life that I love so much. No, senor. I will sell you one string, two strings, or maybe three strings. But I will not sell you all of them."

# BOOK LOVERS DEPARTMENT



Conducted by T. Tobin

## CATHOLIC AUTHOR OF THE MONTH

GRAHAM GREENE, 1904-

Catholic Novelist

### I. Life:

Details about the personal life of Graham Greene are not too plentiful, as he feels that his work is of greater importance than the facts of his life. He was born in England in 1904, the son of Charles Henry and Marion Greene. His education was received at Berkhamsted, where his father was headmaster, and at Balliol College, Oxford. After leaving Oxford, Greene held a number of newspaper positions as correspondent, literary editor and film critic. In 1927 he married Vivien Dayrell-Browning, and they have had two children. Greene's great love of travel has led him into many different countries. During World War II he served with the British Foreign Office. Now he devotes his time to his writing.

### II. Writings:

Graham Greene has been acclaimed by all as one of the fine literary craftsmen of the day, and his reading public has been in no way limited to the Catholic world. He, Marshall and Waugh are three of the younger English Catholic authors who have received almost universal acceptance. Greene is a master of suspense and an excellent portrayer of the motives that move the human heart.

His works of travel include: *Journey Without Maps* and *The Lawless Roads*. The author divides his fiction into two classes, "entertainments", written only for amuse-

ment, and "novels of ideas", written for instruction. His "entertainments" include his mystery stories, *The Ministry of Fear* and *The Confidential Agent*.

In his "novels of ideas" Greene is concerned with unravelling the tangled skein of good and evil motives that lie so closely together in the soul of man. His frank portrayal of evil may alienate some Catholic readers, not accustomed to such strong meat, but never does his realism condone or justify evil. *Brighton Rock* and *A Gun for Sale* are two of his earlier psychological novels. *The Heart of the Matter* deals with the conflict between duty and a false pity in the soul of an English colonial official. *19 Stories* is a recent collection of his short stories.

### III. The Book:

Graham Greene's best book still remains, *The Labyrinthine Ways*, which was originally published in England as *The Power and the Glory*. It is the character study of a weak priest in Mexico. During the time of the persecution of the Church, the central figure flees from the police. In his soul he is torn between a desire to be true to his calling and a weakness and cowardice that make this desire difficult of attainment. In the end readers will argue whether he reached greatness of soul or not. This book reveals Greene at his best. *The Labyrinthine Ways* was made into the movie, *The Fugitive*, which changed the plot and had none of the power of the original book.

## APRIL BOOK REVIEWS

### A Layman's Faith

*Certainly, I'm a Catholic.* By Thomas McDermott. 154 pp. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. \$2.50.

Thomas McDermott is a young Washington attorney who is interested in presenting the reasonableness of his faith to non-Catholics. Abstracting from the real reason why he is a Catholic, the free gift of God, Mr. McDermott seeks to explain the reasons that would lead him to the Church, even though he were not already a member.

The thesis of the book is that the Catholic pattern of thought and action supplies the real answers to the problems of modern man. The author begins the discussion with the paradox that man is not an answer, but a question. Then he examines man's nature as a composite of body and soul. The two extreme views of man as a body or a pure spirit are rejected as not fitting the facts of the case. Man is next considered as a social being, who must live with others in the home, the community and the state. The Catholic social program of justice and charity are seen as the only practical solution to the problems that confront man in the realms of economics, national and international politics. The last chapter, entitled, "But", advances and refutes the stock objections against the position of the Church.

Mr. McDermott has given us a book that will help solidify the faith of Catholics and enable them to hold their own ground in discussions of the points considered by the author. Sincere non-Catholics would profit by this fair presentation of the truths of the Church in a manner that would appeal to their sense of justice. The author sums up his examination of the doctrines of the faith: "The Catholic system of thought provides me with reasonable and consistent answers to the basic questions troubling me and all mankind."

### Catholics and Psychiatry

*Psychiatry and Asceticism.* By Rev. Felix D. Duffey, C.S.C. 132 pp. St. Louis: B. Herder Co. \$2.00

The author of the practical book, *Testing the Spirit*, which was written for those directing aspirants for the religious life, has given us another book, *Psychiatry and Asceticism*. In this work he attempts to give the attitude of a Catholic to this new system of healing.

The author recognizes the legitimate role of the new science in the diagnosis and treatment of mental disorders, but objects to some of the false assumptions of prominent psychiatrists. Many of the practitioners of this science are imbued with the principles of materialism that deny a soul, the freedom of man, and a God to Whom man is responsible. The thesis of the work is that psychiatry alone does not have material for a complete reordination of the patient's life, because it does not have the goal of God, as the object of man's endeavors, nor does it possess the great means of assistance, that is the grace of God.

After this examination and rejection of some of the principles of modern psychiatry, Father Duffey explains the Catholic psychology of asceticism, mental prayer, self-knowledge, and asceticism. In this section there is made clear the basic insufficiency of any branch of medicine that treats the whole man without any understanding of the spiritual nature of man's soul. Father Duffey has given a fair appraisal of the true value of psychiatry as well as the accidental and inherent dangers in its use. All those concerned with the direction of souls will profit by the experience of the author.

### Russell Janney

*The Vision of Red O'Shea.* By Russell Janney. 48 pp. New York: Coward-McCann. \$1.75.

## The Liguorian

During the famous Communist trials in New York, juror number two, Russell Janney, found a great deal of time for thinking. The results of his meditations are found in his latest book, *The Vision of Red O'Shea*.

Red O'Shea is the white bartender in a tavern in Harlem where he treats all his customers alike. But there is one girl in whom he is particularly interested. The story of Lu and her gangster boy friend is tenderly told in the verse of Red O'Shea. The lesson of this book is the humanitarian idea of the unity of all races, and above all the omnipotence of the mercy of God. Russell Janney is to be congratulated on the greatness of his perceptions of things of the spirit, and the powerful simplicity with which he has expressed these matters in his latest book. It is hoped that God will, one day, give him the fullness of the truth and the peace toward which he is tending.

### Notre Dame Religious Texts

*God and the World of Man*. By Theodore M. Hesburg, C.S.C. 318 pp. Notre Dame: University Press. \$2.50.

*The Christian Virtues*. By Charles E. Sheedy, C.S.C. 361 pp. Notre Dame: University Press. \$3.00.

One of the most successful campaigns conducted during Notre Dame's last football season was the effort by Notre Dame officials to convince the radio listeners and T-V viewers that Notre Dame was not primarily a "football school". Details of the educational facilities and of research projects were presented to the fans. The two books on my desk are further evidence of the educational work at the University.

*God and the World of Man*, by Father Hesburgh, the vice-president of Notre Dame, is a short synopsis of dogmatic theology written for the lay person. The treatise follows the classical plan found in the Latin textbooks: Faith, The One God, the Triune God, Creation, Elevation and Fall of Man, and the End of the World and of Man.

The basic thoughts of the great theologians are presented in a garb that will attract and instruct the modern man or woman.

*The Christian Virtues*, by Father Sheedy, the assistant professor of religion, is a book of moral theology for the college student and the lay reader. The work is greatly indebted to the learned Dominican. Father Merkelbach, for its order and contents. The first six chapters deal with the fundamentals of moral life: the Goal of Life, Human Acts, Law and Conscience, Habit and Virtue, and Divine Life and Supernatural Virtue. The remainder of the chapters examine the various theological and moral virtues in great detail. This is an excellent treatise from a positive viewpoint of the essentials of moral conduct.

### List of Catholic Books

*The Catholic Booklist, 1950*. Edited by Sister Stella Maris, O.P. 74 pp. St. Catharine, Kentucky: St. Catharine Junior College Library. \$.65.

The fifth edition of *The Catholic Booklist*, the yearly list prepared under the auspices of the Catholic Library Association, has just come from the press. Experts give an annotated list of the better books in many different fields. All the more important books are included and the list of books for the young adds a special value. Libraries should have this list. Priests and Sisters would find it of great value when occasion arises to recommend a book to a friend.

### The Scapular

*Take This Scapular*. By Carmelite Fathers and Tertiaries. 270 pp. Chicago: Carmelite Third Order Press. \$2.50.

In this book are found the addresses given at the Carmelite Third Order conferences in Chicago and Englewood. They are designed to assist lay persons to live a life of sanctity in the world. One of the best features in the book is the historical examination of problems about the scapulars by the assistant General of the Carmelite, Father Bartholomew Xiberta. Members of any one of the Third Orders will profit by reading this book.



## Lucid Intervals

The Latin teacher was in fine humor after lunch and instead of settling right down to Latin, he decided to tell the class a couple of jokes he'd heard the night before. Everybody laughed and laughed—except one girl in the first row.

"What's the matter?" asked the Latin teacher. "Haven't you got a sense of humor?"

"I don't have to laugh," said the girl. "I'm transferring to another school Friday, anyhow."

Father: "When I was a boy, I thought nothing of a ten-mile walk."

Son, who is a little tired of hearing about the good old days: "Well, I don't think so much of it myself."

Bride—All men are brutes. My husband promised me a surprise if I learned to cook, so I took lessons.

Friend—That's thrilling. What was the surprise?

Bride—He fired our cook.

A customer approached Lapidus' pushcart and asked the price of herring. "Today," smiled the merchant, "I'm having a special on herrings. Six cents each."

"Six cents!" protested the customer. "Why, down the street is a man who's selling herring for a nickel. And it's the same herring."

"I know, I know," said Lapidus proudly. "But I'm wrapping mine in later editions!"

An old cowboy went to the city and registered at a hotel for the first time in his life. The clerk asked him if he would like a room with running water.

"Heck no!" the cowboy yelled. "What do you think I am, a trout?"

A surgeon, an engineer and a politician were arguing over whose profession was the oldest.

Surgeon—Eve was made from Adam's rib, and that was a surgical operation.

Engineer—Maybe, but prior to that order was created out of chaos, and that was an engineering job.

Politician — But somebody created the chaos.

The doctor was very pleased with his patient's progress. "You're coughing more easily this morning."

Impatient patient: "Well, for gosh sakes, I ought to be. I've been practising all night."

At a meeting of a *Mothers' and Babies* Club one day votes were cast to decide which was the most beautiful baby present. Each baby received one vote!

Two old miners, bachelors, sat in the backwoods. The conversation drifted around, covered politics, and finally reached cooking.

"I got me one a' them thar cook books once, but I never could do anything with it."

"Too much fancy stuff, eh?"

"Thar shor was. Everyone o' them recipes started out the same way. Take a clean dish—and that finished me right thar."

Trying to rest after an exceedingly hard day, poor father was being bedeviled by an endless stream of unanswerable questions from little Willie.

"Whattdaya do down at the office?"

Willie finally asked.

"Nothing!" shouted father in exasperation.

It looked as if the boy had been put off for a while, but not for long. After a thoughtful pause, Willie inquired: "Pop, how do you know when you're through?"